

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Golden Gate National Recreation Area
California



PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY REPORT
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA
**DRAFT DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN/
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**



September 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE 1

 Introduction 1

 Public Comment Process Summary 1

 Nature of Comments Received 1

 The Comment Analysis Process 2

 Definition of Terms 2

 Guide to this Document 3

CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT 4

PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY 11

APPENDIX A. Comments Treated as Individual Concern Statements

INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE

Introduction

Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) prepared the Draft Dog Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft Plan/EIS) to address dog management in the park. The Draft Plan/EIS describes six dog management alternatives, including the preferred alternative (chosen from alternatives A-E), at 21 GGNRA sites distributed across San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo counties. The Draft Plan/EIS explained the purpose and need for the plan, presented the alternatives and identified the preferred alternative for each of the 21 sites. The Draft Plan/EIS also detailed the resources that would be affected by the alternatives and the environmental consequences of implementing these alternatives. Because of the diversity of resources and the variety of use patterns across these park sites, a site-specific approach to analyzing the alternatives was adopted, resulting in a preferred alternative for each site.

Public Comment Process Summary

On January 14, 2011, the NPS released the Draft Plan/EIS to the public for review and comment. The draft plan/EIS was available for public review until May 30, 2011.

During the public comment period, four public meetings were held in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties. Meetings were held in Mill Valley on March 2nd; in San Francisco on March 5th and 7th; and in Pacifica on March 9th. Three of the meetings were held in the evening from 4:00 until 8:00 p.m.; one San Francisco meeting was held during the day, from 11:00 a.m. till 4:00 p.m. The public meetings were in an open house format, with a number of National Park Service staff on hand to discuss the plan with meeting attendees, answer questions and facilitate public input on the plan.

The public were able to submit their comments on Draft Plan/EIS using any of the following methods:

- Electronically through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website
- In person at the public meetings
- By mailing comments to the GGNRA Superintendent

Nature of Comments Received

Nearly 5,000 pieces of correspondence from over 31 states were received during the public scoping period. The majority of correspondence, 4,463, were submitted by California residents. Among the commenters from California, the topics that received the majority of the comments were expressions of support for, or opposition to, the Draft Plan/EIS; expressions of support for, or opposition to, the different alternatives at each site; concerns regarding the park visitor experience; concerns for wildlife and wildlife habitat and concerns about the health and safety of individuals and dogs.

All comments were carefully read and analyzed; a summary of the concerns expressed is presented in this report. Commenters are encouraged to visit the GGNRA website <http://www.nps.gov/goga/parkmgmt/dog-management.htm> for updates on the project's progress and additional information about this project.

The Comment Analysis Process

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and combine similar public comments into a format that can be used by decision makers and the GGNRA Dog Management Team. Comment analysis assists the team in organizing, clarifying, and addressing technical information pursuant to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations. It also aids in identifying the topics and issues to be evaluated and considered throughout the planning process.

The process includes five main components:

Developing a coding structure

Employing a comment database for comment management

Reading and coding of public comments

Interpreting and analyzing the comments to identify issues and themes

Preparing a comment summary

A coding structure was developed to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. The coding structure was derived from an analysis of the range of topics discussed during internal NPS scoping, past planning documents, and the comments themselves. The coding structure was designed to capture all comment content rather than to restrict or exclude any ideas.

The NPS PEPC database was used for management of the comments. The database stores the full text of all correspondence and allows each comment to be coded by topic and issue. Some outputs from the database include tallies of the total number of correspondence and comments received, sorting and reporting of comments by a particular topic or issue, and demographic information regarding the sources of the comments.

Analysis of the public comments involved the assignment of the codes to statements made by the public in their letters, email messages, voicemails, and comments stated at the public meetings. All comments were read and analyzed.

Although the analysis process attempts to capture the full range of public concerns, this content analysis report should be used with caution. Comments from people who chose to respond do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire public. Furthermore, this was not a vote-counting process, and the emphasis was on content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received. This report is intended to be a summary of the comments received, rather than a statistical analysis.

Definition of Terms

Primary terms used in this document are defined below.

Correspondence: A correspondence is the entire document received from a commenter. It can be in the form of a letter, email, written comment form, note card, open house transcript, or petition. Each piece of correspondence is assigned a unique identification number in the PEPC system.

Comment: A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. It should include information such as an expression of support or opposition to the use of a potential management tool,

additional data regarding an existing condition, or an opinion debating the adequacy of the analysis.

Code: A grouping centered on a common subject. The codes were developed during the scoping process and are used to track major subjects throughout the EIS process.

Concern: Concerns are a written summary of all comments received under a particular code. Some codes were further separated into several concern statements to provide a better focus on the content of the comments.

Guide to this Document

This report is organized as follows:

Content Analysis Report: This is the basic report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers and types of comments received, organized by code. The first section of the report provides a summary of the number of comments that were coded under each topic. The second section provides general demographic information, such as the states where commenters live, the number of letters received from different categories of organizations, etc.

Public Scoping Comment Summary: This report summarizes the substantive comments received during the scoping process. These comments are organized by codes and further organized into concern statements. Below each concern statement are representative quotes, which have been taken directly from the text of the public's comments and have not been edited; therefore some spelling and grammar errors were not corrected. Representative quotes further clarify the concern statements.

CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT

Comment Distribution by Code

Code	Description	# of Comments
AD1100	Alternative Development: Comments to Process	15
AL1000	Suggest New Alternative Elements	1681
AL1010	Suggest an Alternative that has Been Dismissed	786
AL5000	Comments on Dog walking Permit System	437
AN1000	Comments on ANPR	8
AT1100	Alta Trail: Support Preferred Alternative	6
AT1200	Alta Trail: Oppose Preferred Alternative	9
AT1300	Alta Trail: Desire Other Alternative	16
AT1400	Alta Trail: Suggest Change in Alternative	13
AW1000	Animal Welfare: Impact on/to dogs	153
BB1100	Baker Beach: Support Preferred Alternative	11
BB1200	Baker Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative	28
BB1300	Baker Beach: Desire Other Alternative	31
BB1400	Baker Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative	26
CB1000	Comments Regarding the Compliance Based Management Strategy	802
CC2000	Consultation and Coordination: Reg-Neg process	10
CF1100	Crissy Field: Support Preferred Alternative	57
CF1200	Crissy Field: Oppose Preferred Alternative	125
CF1300	Crissy Field: Desire Other Alternative	106
CF1400	Crissy Field: Suggest Change in Alternative	158
CO1000	Coastal Zone Consistency Determination	0
CO1100	Comments Considered an Individual Concern Statement	20
CR2010	Cultural Resources: Affected Environment	9
CR4000	Cultural Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	5
CR5000	Cultural Resources: Cumulative Impacts	0
CR6000	Cultural Resources: Impairment Analyses	0
CS1100	Cattle/Sweeney: Support Preferred Alternative	6
CS1200	Cattle/Sweeney: Oppose Preferred Alternative	29
CS1300	Cattle/Sweeney: Desire Other Alternative	22
CS1400	Cattle/Sweeney: Suggest Change in Alternative	20
DC1000	Duplicate comment	43
ED1000	Editorial	66
EJ2010	Environmental Justice: Affected Environment	16
EJ4000	Environmental Justice: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives	25
EJ5000	Environmental Justice: Cumulative Impacts	0
FB1100	Fort Baker: Support Preferred Alternative	5
FB1200	Fort Baker: Oppose Preferred Alternative	4

Code	Description	# of Comments
FB1300	Fort Baker: Desire Other Alternative	6
FB1400	Fort Baker: Suggest Change in Alternative	5
FF1100	Fort Funston: Support Preferred Alternative	34
FF1200	Fort Funston: Oppose Preferred Alternative	287
FF1300	Fort Funston: Desire Other Alternative	153
FF1400	Fort Funston: Suggest Change in Alternative	159
FM1100	Fort Mason: Support Preferred Alternative	6
FM1200	Fort Mason: Oppose Preferred Alternative	8
FM1300	Fort Mason: Desire Other Alternative	6
FM1400	Fort Mason: Suggest Change in Alternative	19
FP1100	Fort Point: Support Preferred Alternative	4
FP1200	Fort Point: Oppose Preferred Alternative	1
FP1300	Fort Point: Desire Other Alternative	1
FP1400	Fort Point: Suggest Change in Alternative	10
FT1100	Fort Miley: Support Preferred Alternative	1
FT1200	Fort Miley: Oppose Preferred Alternative	2
FT1300	Fort Miley: Desire Other Alternative	2
FT1400	Fort Miley: Suggest Change in Alternative	3
GA1000	Impact Analysis: General Comment	342
GA2000	Impact Analysis: Use Trends And Assumptions	77
GA3000	Impact Analysis: General Methodology For Establishing Impacts/Effects	469
GA4000	Impact Analysis: Impairment Analysis-General Methodology	1
GC1000	Off-leash dogs: Support	608
GC2000	Off-leash dogs: Oppose	204
GC3000	General Comment: Support current management	712
GC4000	General Comment: Continue to allow dogs within GGNRA	178
GC4010	General Comment: Ban all dogs from GGNRA	113
GC5000	On-leash dogs: Support	251
GC6000	On-leash Dogs: Oppose	43
GC7000	General Comment: Support New Dog Management Plan	348
GC8000	General Comment: Oppose New Dog Management Plan	1381
GC9000	General Comment: Support Alternative A for All Sites	47
GC9010	General Comment: Support Alternative B for All Sites	51
GC9020	General Comment: Support Alternative C for All Sites	20
GC9030	General Comment: Support Alternative D for All Sites	151
GC9040	General Comment: Support Alternative E for All Sites	8
GC9050	General Comment: Oppose Alternative A for All Sites	5
GC9060	General Comment: Oppose Alternative B for All Sites	6
GC9070	General Comment: Oppose Alternative C for All Sites	3
GC9080	General Comment: Oppose Alternative D for All Sites	6
GC9090	General Comment: Oppose Alternative E for All Sites	6

Code	Description	# of Comments
GR2010	Geologic/Soil Resources: Affected Environment	28
GR4000	Geologic Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	8
GR5000	Geologic Resources: Cumulative Impacts	2
GR6000	Geologic Resources: Impairment Analyses	1
HS2010	Health and Safety: Affected Environment	157
HS4000	Health and Safety: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives	106
HS4010	Health and Safety: Impacts of Dogs vs. Humans	87
HS4015	Health and Safety: Impacts of Dog Related Incidents	55
HS5000	Health and Safety: Cumulative Impacts	1
HV1100	Homestead Valley: Support Preferred Alternative	2
HV1200	Homestead Valley: Oppose Preferred Alternative	4
HV1300	Homestead Valley: Desire Other Alternative	14
HV1400	Homestead Valley: Suggest Change in Alternative	2
LE1100	Lands End: Support Preferred Alternative	2
LE1200	Lands End: Oppose Preferred Alternative	8
LE1300	Lands End: Desire Other Alternative	6
LE1400	Lands End: Suggest Change in Alternative	13
LP1000	Laws and Policies: Impact of GGNRA actions on other NPS units' enforcement of servicewide policies and regulations	22
LU1000	Land Use: Policies and Historical Use	119
LU2000	Other Agencies Policies and mandates Regarding Dog Management	5
LU3000	Land Use: Dog Parks Provided by San Francisco and Other Municipalities	96
LU3010	Adjacent Lands: Impacts to other State or County Parks	150
LU3020	Adjacent Lands: Impacts to other Dog Parks	191
MB1100	Muir Beach: Support Preferred Alternative	22
MB1200	Muir Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative	95
MB1300	Muir Beach: Desire Other Alternative	56
MB1400	Muir Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative	43
MH1100	Marin Headlands: Support Preferred Alternative	11
MH1200	Marin Headlands: Oppose Preferred Alternative	23
MH1300	Marin Headlands: Desire Other Alternative	26
MH1400	Marin Headlands: Suggest Change in Alternative	16
MP1100	Mori Point: Support Preferred Alternative	7
MP1200	Mori Point: Oppose Preferred Alternative	22
MP1300	Mori Point: Desire Other Alternative	31
MP1400	Mori Point: Suggest Change in Alternative	31
MR1100	Milagra Ridge: Support Preferred Alternative	8
MR1200	Milagra Ridge: Oppose Preferred Alternative	6
MR1300	Milagra Ridge: Desire Other Alternative	16
MR1400	Milagra Ridge: Suggest Change in Alternative	12
MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments	212

Code	Description	# of Comments
NL1100	New Lands: Support Preferred Alternative	8
NL1200	New Lands: Oppose Preferred Alternative	58
NL1300	New Lands: Desire Other Alternative	67
NL1400	New Lands: Suggest Change in Alternative	71
NL1500	New Lands: Question Definition of New Lands	5
OB1100	Ocean Beach: Support Preferred Alternative	26
OB1200	Ocean Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative	59
OB1300	Ocean Beach: Desire Other Alternative	60
OB1400	Ocean Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative	72
OV1100	Oakwood Valley: Support Preferred Alternative	8
OV1200	Oakwood Valley: Oppose Preferred Alternative	32
OV1300	Oakwood Valley: Desire Other Alternative	25
OV1400	Oakwood Valley: Suggest Change in Alternative	12
PN4000	Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority	89
PN7000	Purpose and Need: Adequacy of EIS Purpose and Need	18
PN8000	Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action	20
PO2010	Park Operations: Affected Environment	98
PO4000	Park Operations: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	114
PO5000	Park Operations: Impacts	2
PP1100	Pedro Point: Support Preferred Alternative	2
PP1200	Pedro Point: Oppose Preferred Alternative	5
PP1300	Pedro Point: Desire Other Alternative	6
PP1400	Pedro Point: Suggest Change in Alternative	9
PS1000	Comment Regarding Public Scoping Process	87
RB1100	Rodeo Beach: Support Preferred Alternative	18
RB1200	Rodeo Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative	20
RB1300	Rodeo Beach: Desire Other Alternative	24
RB1400	Rodeo Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative	12
RF1000	References: General Comments	2
SA1100	Site Accessibility	131
SB1100	Stinson Beach: Support Preferred Alternative	6
SB1200	Stinson Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative	9
SB1300	Stinson Beach: Desire Other Alternative	9
SB1400	Stinson Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative	11
SH1100	Sutro Heights: Support Preferred Alternative	3
SH1200	Sutro Heights: Oppose Preferred Alternative	5
SH1300	Sutro Heights: Desire Other Alternative	3
SH1400	Sutro Heights: Suggest Change in Alternative	8
TE2010	Threatened and Endangered Species: Affected Environment	264
TE4000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	476
TE5000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Cumulative Impacts	0

Code	Description	# of Comments
TE6000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Impairment Analyses	0
VR2010	Vegetation and Riparian Areas: Affected Environment	73
VR4000	Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	20
VR5000	Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Cumulative Impacts	0
VR6000	Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Impairment Analyses	0
VU2010	Visitor Use and Experience: Affected Environment	354
VU4000	Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Enjoy Dogs	322
VU4005	Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Do Not Enjoy Dogs	156
VU4010	Visitor Use and Experience: Actions of Dog Owners	0
VU4015	Visitor Use and Experience: Concern Statement of a Dog Owner	0
VU4020	Visitor Use and Experience: Concern Statement of Non Dog Owners	0
VU4025	Visitor Use and Experience: Professional Dog Walkers	340
VU5000	Visitor Use and Experience: Cumulative Impacts	1
WH2010	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Affected Environment	302
WH4000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	206
WH5000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts	0
WH6000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impairment Analyses	0
WQ4000	Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	11
WQ5000	Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts	0
WQ6000	Water Resources: Impairment Analyses	0
WR2010	Water Resources: Affected Environment	13
Total		9517

(Note: Each comment may have multiple codes. As a result, the total number of comments may be different than the actual comment totals)

Correspondence Signature Count by Correspondence Type

Organization Type	# of Correspondences
County Government	2
Business	2
Federal Government	6
Conservation/Preservation	5
Non-Governmental	36
State Government	4
Unaffiliated Individual	4789
Civic Groups	9
Total	4853

Correspondence Signature Count by Correspondence Type

Type	# of Correspondences
Web Form	3772
Other	174
Park Form	221
Letter	656
E-mail	30
Total	4853

Correspondence Distribution by State

State	Percentage	# of Correspondences
AK	0%	1
AR	0%	1
AZ	0%	1
CA	92%	4463
CO	0%	4
CT	0%	2
DC	0%	3
DE	0%	1
FL	0%	4
IL	0%	3
IN	0%	1
KY	0%	3
MA	0%	4
MD	0%	1
MI	0%	1
NC	0%	2
ND	0%	1
NJ	0%	1
NM	0%	1
NV	0%	3
NY	0%	4
OH	0%	1
OK	0%	4
OR	0%	9
PA	0%	4
RI	0%	1
TN	0%	1
UN	6%	312
VA	0%	3
WA	0%	6

State	Percentage	# of Correspondences
WI	0%	2
Total		4853

Golden Gate NRA
Dog Management Draft Plan/DEIS
GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement
Concern Response Report

Report Date: 09/07/2011

AD1100 - Alternative Development: Comments to Process

Concern ID: 29823

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

NPS should supply the research used to develop the alternatives. This plan proposes major changes to access for dog walkers. The changes are not supported by the findings in the EIS. Impacts from noncompliance are not well documented. NPS should evaluate baseline conditions for specific sites before changing the status.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1168

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193540

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not pretend to speak for all lands under the CGNRA. It may be that some parcels of land would actually benefit from reduced or eliminated dog access. However, the draft dog management plan proposes across-the-board cutbacks in dog access to virtually all CGNRA land. This approach to dog management seriously undermines the individual findings contained in the report. In other words, CGNRA greatly loses credibility when it makes the same recommendation for so many parcels of land that are clearly so different from one another.

Corr. ID: 2033

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193266

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Where is the research that was undertaken on the foregoing in creating the Alternatives?

Corr. ID: 3929

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205780

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is questionable that noncompliance (of dogs going off-leash in on-leash areas) will necessarily cause any impacts. I ask that the GGNRA reevaluate its logic behind its arguments and look at the baseline conditions in specific areas before coming up with a new alternative.

Concern ID: 29825

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The geographic scope of the EIS should have been broader. Some commenters state the EIS should have addressed all lands within GGNRA. All areas addressed in the 1979 Pet Policy should have been evaluated in the DEIS. Commenters requested the scope be expanded to address all fire roads in and adjacent to GGNRA, especially in Marin County. Rancho should be evaluated with a balanced set of alternatives in the EIS.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3786

Organization: Cayuga Improvement Association

Comment ID: 205539

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I was also disappointed that areas like the Tennessee Valley trail in Marin were left out of the report. I was told this was because dogs are not currently allowed there. All GGNRA properties should have been in the report. The report should have been written describing how dogs are managed on ALL GGNRA property. The report should reflect the entire scope of the GGNRA property and truly reflect how many areas do and to not allow dogs. When you exclude an area you are exaggerating how much of the total acreage is open to dogs now and how much of a change you are making

Corr. ID: 3991

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207412

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The fire roads listed above are 12 feet wide on average, providing plenty of room for multiple use. Dogs on a 6 foot leash will not be causing damage to wildlife or native habitat, or disturbing other users. These fire roads are all adjacent to the freeway and/or the communities of Southern Marin. They are not in the heart of the Headlands. They can all be accessed from outside the GGNRA reducing auto traffic into the GGNRA.

There has been little or no discussion of on-leash access for dogs in the GGNRA, the focus of concern has been off-leash / voice control use. For those of us who hike long distances with our dogs, on-leash access is important. As the Baby Boomers age, having a dog along on-leash on a long hike is an issue of safety and ensures that we will continue to exercise.

Corr. ID: 3991

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207411

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I request the NPS consider an Alternative that would allow dogs on-leash on the fire roads that run out of the GGNRA and/or border the boundaries between the GGNRA and the communities that are adjacent to the GGNRA. The fire roads and the two trails listed below would allow a person with a dog on-leash to walk in the GGNRA in Marin from the southern end of Sausalito on the fire roads that are near the eastern boundary of the GGNRA north to Marin City and Tam Valley, and then to walk west along the fire roads near the northern boundary of the GGNRA to Muir Beach.

- The GGNRA shares a border with Sausalito, Mill Valley, Muir Beach and unincorporated Marin County land including Marin City and Tam Valley. The fire roads that connect the GGNRA to these communities and the fire roads that run near the boundaries of the GGNRA with these communities should be accessible to the public walking with their dogs on-leash.

- The fire roads that lead from the neighboring communities into the GGNRA and run adjacent to them are, from Muir Beach in the north to Sausalito in the south:

- Coastal Trail from Muir Beach to Coastal Fire Road to Coyote Ridge Trail (a fire road) to Miwok Trail (a fire road).

- Miwok Trail from Highway 1 to Coyote Ridge Trail.

- Miwok Trail from Tennessee Valley Road to Coyote Ridge Trail.

- Marin Drive from Tam Valley to the Miwok Trail.

- County View Road from Tam Valley to the Miwok Trail.

- Tennessee Valley Road (or the adjacent Rhubarb Trail (Marin County trail)) to Oakwood Valley Fire Road.

- Oakwood Valley Fire Road from Tennessee Valley Road to Alta Trail (a fire road).

- Alta Trail from Donahue Avenue in Marin City to Rodeo Valley Trail.

- Pacheco Fire Road from Marin City to Alta Trail.

- Orchard Fire Road from Marin City to Alta Trail.

- Rodeo Avenue from Highway 101 to Alta Trail.

- We are requesting on-leash access to two trails because they provide access to 2 of the fire roads listed above:

- The Morning Sun Trail that was built to provide access from Sausalito to the GGNRA Headlands; it goes from the Spencer Ave bus-pad on the west side of 101 up to Alta Trail.

- The SCA trail that runs parallel to Wolfback Ridge Road and about 20 feet below it. This trail connects Alta Trail with the fire road (this one is un-named) that goes over the 101 tunnel and then back into Sausalito (it comes out on Hecht Avenue).

Corr. ID: 4005

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206272

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It has been posited that only three of the areas in the 1979 Pet Policy for Marin County were

Discussed by the Reg Neg committee. Further, few of the areas included in the 1979 Pet Policy

for Marin are included for consideration in the Draft Plan/DEIS alternatives for Marin. This

appears to be a serious oversight in my view.

Concern ID:

29827

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters were concerned about the alternative development process. A no dog alternative should have been included to comply with NEPA. The ROLA certification program should not have been eliminated due to cost concerns.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4070

Organization: Mar Vista Stables

Comment ID: 207709

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Chapter 2 Alternatives

14)Alternative Elements Eliminated from Further Analysis-Pg. 93, First whole paragraph, "This program was cost prohibitive and would have required substantial park staff time" Cost is not an acceptable reason for eliminating an alternative. If this type of management is too costly than the park service should not allow the activity in the first place.

Corr. ID: 4070

Organization: Mar Vista Stables

Comment ID: 207676

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1)Why wasn't a global no dog alternative analyzed in the DEIS? It may not be preferred among most users, but it would satisfy the requirements under NEPA and show a good comparison of how excluding a certain use would socially affect visitors.

Concern ID:

29833

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

NPS should have involved local citizens and citizen groups more in the development of the plan.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4013

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206813

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Perhaps the most striking feature about the proposed DDMP was the fact that local citizens (including dog owners) were not able to participate in regulation drafting. By leaving out & not actively working with the local public population, the NPS created a DDMP that ignores the needs of very people who most often use the GGNRA resources. The DDMP does include a background (though biased) on the construction of a dog management/EIS plan.

The NPS efforts in 2004- 2006 to implement the Negotiating Rulemaking act and form a "neutral party" (the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee) to help draft a dog management plan was by far the best effort to include the local public in design regulation. The NRC actually contained representatives from a variety of different interest groups. The DDMP states that the NRC was able to reach consensus "on nine guiding principles, guidelines for commercial dog walking, and a site-specific alternative for Oakwood Valley (Marin County)." The NRC failed to reach consensus of other issues - "special regulation for dog management at GGNRA".

Corr. ID: 4262 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209147 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I was upset to see that GGNRA has decided, without inputs from the local

community (other than one meeting at Farallone View where the majority of the people spoke overwhelmingly in favor of allowing dog access), to ban all dogs from the property. In my opinion, this is not only unjust to the local community and doesn't support the established mixed use, but is not founded on research or analysis.

Concern ID:

31917

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters questioned what was used to develop the alternatives, and felt that the methods and justifications should be provided in more detail.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4666 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209160 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternatives Arbitrary; Alternative Development Process flawed, not disclosed

This section beginning on p. 45 is named the "alternative development process" however no process is identified and no rationale is presented for why the alternatives were developed the way they were. No resource protection priorities or use conflict goals were identified for the areas, which is necessary to assess the ability of the alternative to meet the goals in a manner that does not unnecessarily infringe on recreational uses without providing measurable benefit. Much more detail is needed for disclosing the alternatives development rationale and process, especially since no clear logic is apparent in the development of the alternatives - it appears very arbitrary. General themes were used to name the alternatives (e.g. multiple use, most protective, etc.) but no information is provided as to how this theme is accomplished for the particular resources and user conflicts that are occurring in that park unit. The DEIS only states that the internal NEPA team discussed strategies and management goals. It states that there was an internal site-specific analysis (p. 46) that guided the development of alternatives, but this information is not included in the document, so is not available to the public. We are told on page 46 that Chapter 2 provides an overview of how the analysis of data, expert opinion, and best professional judgment was applied to develop management alternatives, but no such overview is included. Chapter 2 simply states that the team's internal discussions resulted in the formation of alternatives presented.

AL1000 - Suggest New Alternative Elements

Concern ID: 29682

CONCERN STATEMENT: Number of Dogs per Walker - The park should limit the number of dogs per walker to three with no exceptions. Commenters find it hard to believe that one person can handle more than 3 dogs. Also, visitors should not be allowed to stop and congregate.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** **Organization:** *Not Specified*

79

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223780

Representative Quote: 5. One owner should be limited to 3 dogs on leash and if in an off leash area, one dog off leash.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

285

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181009

Representative Quote: Limit dog walkers and the number of dogs allowed per person. When I see a walker with 10 dogs, 4 on leash, 6 off, I know there will be problems.

Corr. ID: Organization: GGNP Conservancy & Golden Gate Audubon Society

1026

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191801

Representative Quote: 2.) There should be a limit of 3 dogs per person. It is not appropriate for the Park Service to create commercial permits for commercial/professional dog walkers. Also, it is unlikely that most visitors with dogs will be able to keep control of more than 3 dogs at one time.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1714

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191154

Representative Quote: We needs some off leash dog walking areas + real hiking areas not Mill Valley dogs parks.

In addition, I think limiting dogs in one area like dog walkers gathering should be stopped. I believe this is part of the problem when 3 dog walkers gather to chat you will see 18-21 dogs which is intimidating to some people. 6-8 dogs per dog walker is great but no gathering will probably alleviate the problems.

So in summary, please keep real hiking trails + beaches available for off leash dogs + limit gathering of dogs.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2353

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195377

Representative Quote: I would like to see the NPS adopt the preferred alternative for all others areas under consideration as well, with one exception: there should be no exceptions to the three dogs per person limit, for either commercial or individual dog walkers, in the ROLAs. One person cannot reasonably be expected to keep more than three dogs under sight and voice control; allowing this even by permit is likely to cause the ROLAs to be revoked under the compliance procedures outlined in the draft document. It would probably be simpler to maintain the three-dog limit throughout the dog-walking areas, rather than allowing six dogs in the on-leash areas and only three in the ROLAs, but staff knows much better than I whether that is the case.

Concern ID: 29683

CONCERN Fees - Commenters suggest requiring a daily, monthly, or annual dog walking fee at the park. Fee **STATEMENT:** costs could cover maintenance or restoration of the area.

Representative **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s): 279

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

180933

Representative Quote: I also request that you consider a dog license system with a reasonable annual fee that would allow dogs full use of the park and go into a fund used for restoration and mitigating adverse impacts.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

339

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181110

Representative Quote: We pay enough taxes here to be able to enjoy the beautiful beaches and woods of SF with our canine companions.

That said, if this is not feasible, I would propose a fee and registration for dogs to run offleash and frequent certain areas. This could allow regulation of which dogs are allowed to be offleash and would bring revenue to the city to care for any dog related expenses.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

378

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181166

Representative Quote: Why ban dogs from being off-leash. Like most government policy, it comes down to money. So why not require a usage fee for these areas. I'm sure most dog owners would be willing to pay \$15/ dog annually to use these areas. Just think, with 100,000+ registered dogs in SF alone, the revenue that would be generated to fill your pockets

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1483

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223789

Representative Quote: 4. Add a fee onto dog licensure to pay for these services.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1726

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191180

Representative Quote: I support option A for allowing off leash dogs: the options listed in the executive summary do not include a proposal to license dog owner for a fee to walk their dogs of leash. I do support limiting commercial dog walkers to 3 dogs. Or a maximum of 6 dogs

Concern ID: 29684

CONCERN Muzzles - Commenters suggest requiring muzzles on dogs, specifically those being walked off-
STATEMENT: leash. This would protect visitor safety.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

79

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223769

Representative Quote: 2. All dogs should be muzzled everywhere. In particular if they are off leash.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

631

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

182496

Representative Quote: If the GGNRA does decide to keep off leash areas, they should be muzzle requirements that are enforced. The maximum fine for breaking leash rules or muzzle rules should be \$1000 (minimum\$200).

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
727

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
182735

Representative Quote: I support the alternatives that are the most protective to the wildlife and for human safety. I have human safety concerns about dogs off leash. I am one of the many victims of dog bites. I want to see on leash requirement as well as muzzle requirments everywhere for this reason. No human should be banned from a part of the park because dangerous animals are allowed to run free.

Concern ID: 29685

CONCERN Aggressive Dogs - Aggressive dogs including those breeds such as pit bulls that are considered
STATEMENT:aggressive should not be allowed at the park. If these dogs are not banned, they should be required to always be on-leash.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*
79

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
223771

Representative Quote: 4. Pit bulls and other breeds that are bred to be aggressive should not be allowed in the park.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
288

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
181015

Representative Quote: Look at places like Pt. Isabel, where signs clearly state that aggressive dogs must be on leash. They are on leash, and if not, they get reported and don't come back. It works.

Concern ID: 29686

CONCERN Fencing - Commenters suggest using fences/barriers/vegetation and possibly entrance gates to
STATEMENT:keep off-leash dogs in certain areas and away from sensitive resources.

For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29444 (CF1100), Comment 210027.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*
441

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
181693

Representative Quote: Thank you for your work on this DEIS. I support the proposed alternative, with one major exception:

I am very disappointed that the proposed alternative does not require that all areas for off leash dogs be fenced or otherwise physically restricted. The foremost duty of the National Park Service in all units is to protect its units' resources. Off leash dogs that are not enclosed by physical barriers, whether natural or man-made, pose a serious threat to those resources. Dogs do not recognize human boundaries if those boundaries are not physically restricted, and off leash dogs will wander outside them. Once they do, there is a strong chance that they will negatively impact the park resources. Physically restricting off leash dog areas is the only way to ensure that dogs will not run off leash where they will negatively impact people, wildlife, and even leashed dogs

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

472

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181761

Representative Quote: After having many encounters with off leash, poorly socialized dogs, my belief is that dogs should be on a leash anytime the dog is not on the dog owners property or in a dog park designed for running dogs off leash. They should not be off leash in common areas where other humans are.

If the GGNRA is going to allow dogs to run in some areas, I think there should be a fence designating where the dogs are allowed off leash as most dog owners "stretch" the boundries.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

928

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191385

Representative Quote: All off-leash dog areas should be fenced or clearly delimited for the protection of other park visitors and dogs. Park visitors should be given a choice about whether they will interact with off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: Organization: Davis Dog Owners Group

2439

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200770

Representative Quote: I believe that dogs should NOT be allowed off leash in any area where wildlife can be impacted -- and this seems to be the case in most areas of Golden Gate Park. If there is any way you can barricade off a few acres to make, as it were, a marine dog park, possibly where human recreational activity has already displaced the wildlife, I would be grateful.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2663

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195436

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my opinion that all off-leash areas should be enclosed to protect park users, wildlife, and other dogs. Simply, limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats.

Corr. ID: Organization: Sierra Club et al

2739

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195595

Representative Quote: Require all off-leash areas to be enclosed to protect park users, wildlife, and other dogs. This solution is perfectly all right for most if not all dog owners. They are grateful that their dogs are enclosed and protected as well. By Limiting off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats, this will allow delicate wildlife (hatchlings etc) to be protected during the time when they are small and vulnerable.

Corr. ID: Organization: ASPCA

3077

CommentOrganization Type: Non-Governmental

ID:

201290

Representative Quote: On behalf of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) our organization has concerns about the Draft Dog Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement, and in particular the preferred alternative that is set forth in this plan.

The preferred alternative includes only one fully enclosed off-leash dog play area (or as referred to in the plan, a "regulated off-leash area"). This sole fully enclosed off-leash dog play area in the preferred alternative was the product of a multi-year negotiated rulemaking process between off-leash advocates, environmentalists, and other user groups. Yet despite this being the sole point of consensus across these diverse groups, the National Park Service has not attempted to provide additional enclosed off-leash play areas anywhere else in the GGNRA: all the remaining areas proposed for off-leash dog play are not enclosed.

The ASPCA supports the development of dog parks. However, we believe it is imperative to have secure fencing and gates. It is also best if the park enclosure incorporates double gates or an interior "holding pen" at the entrance, so people and their dogs can enter and exit without accidentally letting other dogs slip out of the park.

In the absence of physical barriers around an off-leash dog play areas, dogs may be lost, injured or killed. This is why a cornerstone of good off-leash park design is to enclose the area: not merely for the protection of other users, but also for the safety of our dogs. As mentioned in the proposed plan, dogs continue to be lost, injured or killed at the GGNRA because the off-leash areas at the Park presently are not enclosed. A simple enclosure would remedy this problem, while ensuring that all park users get to choose the kind of experience they desire by choosing to either enter, or not, these fully enclosed areas.

Outside of these enclosed areas, our organization supports the enforcement of leash laws in general because such laws provide important safeguards for people, our pets, wildlife, and parks. Enforcement of the National Park System's leash law and the creation of enclosed off leash play areas for dogs would insure dogs have reasonable access to the Park without jeopardizing the safety of anyone.

Corr. ID: Organization: Wild Equity Institute
3759

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:
228505

Representative Quote: The Park Service seems to believe that only 6-foot high chain-link fences, perhaps with barbed-wire along the top, are the only physical enclosure that can be placed around off-leash dog parks. But this is far from the case. Off-leash dog parks can have a variety of physical barriers, including features from the natural environment. Indeed, a fully-enclosed off-leash dog park proposal for Lake Merritt included butterfly garden draped around the enclosure. At it' core, this argument is simply a design problem, not a problem that is so intractable that it is justify to exclude from alternatives analysis. If an area is inappropriate for a physical barrier, than it is not an acceptable place to allow dogs to roam off-leash.

Corr. ID: Corr. ID: 3759
3759

CommentComment ID: 204627
ID:
204627

Representative Quote: Ensuring that dog play areas are safe is not rocket science: it is a simple design problem with a basic, widely adopted solution. Safe off-leash dog play areas must be fully-enclosed with a physical barrier-and preferably all entry and exit points double-gated-to ensure the safety of park users and protect park resources.

Enclosed off-leash dog play areas ensure that our dogs do not fall off cliffs, run into traffic, or are lost while visiting the GGNRA; they ensure, when properly located, that wildlife will not be harmed or harassed by dogs; and they empower park visitors, giving them the power to choose if and when to have off-leash dog experiences by entering an enclosed area, rather than having the experience imposed upon them whenever they visit the GGNRA.

Ensuring that dog play areas are safe is not rocket science: it is a simple design problem with a basic, widely adopted solution. Safe off-leash dog play areas must be fully-enclosed with a physical barrier-and preferably all entry and exit points double-gated-to ensure the safety of park users and protect park resources.

Enclosed off-leash dog play areas ensure that our dogs do not fall off cliffs, run into traffic, or are lost while visiting the GGNRA; they ensure, when properly located, that wildlife will not be harmed or harassed by dogs; and they empower park visitors, giving them the power to choose if and when to have off-leash dog experiences by entering an enclosed area, rather than having the experience imposed upon them whenever they visit the GGNRA.

And perhaps most importantly, enclosed areas are solidly grounded in the non-impairment mandate that governs the National Park System.

Corr. ID: Organization: Wild Equity Institute
3759

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:
204635

Representative Quote: For all of these reasons, the Wild Equity Institute urges the GGNRA to reject the preferred alternative and, in its place, put-forward a pet management plan that encloses any off-leash dog play area that is permitted under the plan. If enclosures are inappropriate in a specific area, than so is an off-leash dog play area, and alternative dog recreation opportunities, such as on-leash walking, should be considered

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
4592

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:
223782

Representative Quote: 2) Rather than restrictions to protect potentially sensitive areas, consider landscape management. For example, create natural barriers by planting a border of coyote bush. The south end of Fort Funston has introduced coyote bush (the higher, shrub-like variety) which effectively discourages dogs and visitors from entering some areas.

Concern ID: 29687

CONCERN Loop Trails - Commenters suggest adding more loop trails both on-leash and off-leash.

STATEMENT:

Representative **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s): 183

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:
182295

Representative Quote: Of particular disappointment is the fact that many of the trails designated for on- or off-leash walking do not connect or do not create loops. It would be better to have a designated series of trails from a centralized starting point (e.g. Rodeo Beach or Donahue) that can provide owners with a variety of distances and terrain to walk their dogs. I urge you to reassess the proposed dog-friendly trails.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
1632

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:
223784

Representative Quote: Ensure that all off-leash trails provide a continuous round-trip hike, eliminating arbitrary and confusing boundaries. E.g. Homestead Valley Land Trust trails should segue into GGNRA trails, Oakwood Valley should provide a sensible loop. Protect wildlife when it needs protecting.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
1709

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

191140

Representative Quote: 3) We have so few trails as it is. Why restrict them further. It would be nice to see some trails extended so you can go from point A to point B (ex Rodeo Beach to Tennessee Valley) or in a loop (Oak Valley Trail). Instead the trails seem to go from Point A up and back.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1930

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

192269

Representative Quote: Suggest re-evaluation of all proposed dog areas to have a loop trail. For instance, Pedro Point Headlands has one small strip near the highway - all Pedro Pt. residents (or most) would need to drive to walk their dogs on the legal area? Not good for the earth! Please expand on-leash trails in Pedro Point & elsewhere.

Suggest re-evaluation of all proposed dog areas to have a loop trail. For instance, Pedro Point Headlands has one small strip near the highway - all Pedro Pt. residents (or most) would need to drive to walk their dogs on the legal area? Not good for the earth! Please expand on-leash trails in Pedro Point & elsewhere. Thx.

Expand dog walking areas on San Mateo County lands. There is not enough areas available.

Restrict dog walking in and around wildlife habitats. For San Mateo County, and cities - add dog parks that are owned and managed by municipalities where they are located.

Corr. ID: Organization: 3rd Supervisorial District of the County of Marin

3934

CommentOrganization Type: County Government

ID:

205847

Representative Quote: 1. Continuous trail loops will encourage more active engagement with the environment while exercising. Many people, especially those who are aging, walk their dogs on trails such as this as their main exercise. We are all working towards similar goals of a healthier and more vibrant community and loop trails would serve those goals

Concern ID: 29688

CONCERN STATEMENT: Enforcement - Instead of reducing areas for dog walking, monitoring or enforcement of the existing and proposed rules/regulations is needed at the park. Enforcement should include issuing more citations and fines or even banning those that continue to be non-compliant with regulations. Fines should increase with each violation one person receives. Volunteers should be allowed to issue citations or should be on site to monitor and call enforcement when needed. In addition, a tip line or reporting system should be established for visitor's to report offenders.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

63

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181807

Representative Quote: Any plan that includes possible increased interaction, (ie enforcement), between park officials and dogs MUST include a comprehensive training plan and rules of engagement. This MUST include when it is acceptable to use lethal force versus pepper spray/mace or some other solution.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

79

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181843

Representative Quote: 1. The existing laws should be enforced and dog walkers with dogs off

leash should be ticketed.

Corr. ID: Organization: California State University, Sacramento
97

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181927

Representative Quote: This plan removes a recreation opportunity (off-leash dog use) from the spectrum of offerings at GGNRA and this approach is overly restrictable and regrettable, particularly as dogs are becoming more and more common as companions, and norms for acceptable dog behavior are improving. I would simply suggest that the plan be implemented with triggers for increased restrictions (e.g. reports of incidents/injuries) similar to the Limits of Acceptable Change planning process.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
307

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181051

Representative Quote: I think you can do this without the extreme and rash measures of banning off-leash access. I favor fines and expulsion of owners that abuse the rights of others. I don't feel that the park service should be abusing the rights of compliant dog owners and tax payers that use the park off-leash and respectfully.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
631

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223781

Representative Quote: There should also be a fine for harrassment of people who do not like their off leash dogs in on leash/no dog areas. This maximum fine for breaking leash rules and harassment should be \$5,000 (minimum \$500.)

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
694

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

182680

Representative Quote: The current leash laws and the proposed leash laws must be enforced. Park police should ticket any dog walker with a dog off leash. Also, civilians will call to report leash violations and the violators should get heavy fines. These fines should increase (double) with each violation. First violation \$50, second \$100, third \$200, fourth \$400, fifth \$800, sixth \$1600, seventh - 2 year ban from the park and \$10,000 fine for each violation of this ban.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
753

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

185431

Representative Quote: b) implement a citation fee for dog owners not carrying the permit, exceeding dogs per person ratio, and valid dog tags (rabies) and licenses for county of residence.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
969

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191648

Representative Quote: I support dogs on leash everywhere in the GGNRA. Dogs should not be allowed to disturb wildlife in their natural habitat. Every time I go into the GGNRA, I see dogs off leash and destroying the park. In order to enforce these rules, volunteers should be utilized to give offenders tickets. If you decide that it is not appropriate for volunteers to actually give the tickets, they can volunteer to monitor the GGNRA and call the park police to report offenders.

Then the park police would give the tickets.

Corr. ID: Organization: GGNP Conservancy & Golden Gate Audubon Society
1026

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223786

Representative Quote: 3.) Leash and voice control requirements must be strictly enforced throughout the life of the policy. Otherwise proposed on-leash areas will become off-leash areas, as has already happened under the old rules.

Corr. ID: Organization: Pacifica Beach Coalition
1058

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

192159

Representative Quote: I am completely opposed to the plan to ban dogs from some of the GGNRA sites and require leashes on others. I am for ticketing irresponsible dog owners who do not pick up their litter or who allow their dogs to chase birds or animals in the parks.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
1335

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195108

Representative Quote: Existing Park Rangers could easily enforce already existing rules such as picking up pet litter or no chasing of birds. These enforcement actions are all that are needed to ensure responsible dog walking and minimal impact on natural resources and other park visitors from off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
1483

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223790

Representative Quote: 5. Use ticketing fees to deter irresponsible behavior. Put fees towards management.

6. Establish a complaint line.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
1850

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223797

Representative Quote: ii. Provide a tip hot line for dog walkers to call in to report those chronic offenders in terms of leaving pet waste, disturbing habitat and wildlife, etc. The Park Service personnel would be better able to focus efforts on dealing with chronic offenders.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
1854

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200599

Representative Quote: The solution here is not limiting places people can walk their dogs off-leash, but rather imposing stricter penalties on people who don't control their dogs and cause injury to other people, regardless of whether they are in the GGNRA or not.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
1987

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

193166

Representative Quote: In Rocky Mt. National Park, Volunteer Rangers are stationed near entrances to provide maps of dog-friendly areas. Those who ignore the rules are informed that a ranger will be called if rules are ignored

Corr. ID: Organization: SF DOG, Save McLaren Park
3733

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
204580

Representative Quote: Enforcement of already existing regulations should target irresponsible dog owners who create the few problems documented by the GGNRA, while allowing responsible dog owners to continue their traditional off-leash recreation without harassment.

Corr. ID: Organization: Wild Equity Institute
3815

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
226965

Representative Quote: Repeat dog rule offenders should always be cited and chronic offender's fines should increase with the number and severity of the offense.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
3906

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
205562

Representative Quote: These are my personal comments and observations regarding this plan: wilderness protection and conservation is important, but a few irresponsible pet owners should not spoil the rights and experiences of all dog owners. perhaps the parks could institute a volunteer "watch dog" group?

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
4043

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
207320

Representative Quote: Instead better compliance could be achieved through enforcement of the rules already in place. Park rangers should cite owners who do not exhibit voice control of their animal, and also those who do not clean up their dog's excrement. With the policies in place and the proper enforcement, there will be no actual or perceived threat to the natural habitats the GGNRA consist of.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
4372

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
209538

Representative Quote: I was responsible for the signs at Aquatic Park that state No Dogs on Beach. Yet when seeing the signs many continue to off leash their dogs onto the beach. I have never witness proper enforcement or the issuing of citations. A telephone number to call when violations occur is absent from all postings. A suggestion is to have a visible number for reporting dogs on the beach.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
4584

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:
210021

Representative Quote: A simple and effective reporting system should be established. The dog management plan should include a means by which park visitors can easily and effectively report non-compliant behavior. Park visitors are sometimes reluctant to report observed violations due

to the time involved in making the report. A public reporting system should be incorporated into the plan that will be user friendly and workable. Such a system should require only a few moments of time and be an effective documentation of the violation.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4592

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

210005

Representative Quote: Suggestions for management of off-leash recreation

1) Enforcement of the existing regulations. There are already regulations against pet litter, aggressive behavior, etc. I have rarely seen a ranger on the trails at Fort Funston, and never seen anyone get a citation for dog litter. It's almost as if the GGNRA has intentionally let misbehavior occur so that they will have an excuse to get rid of dogs.

Concern ID: 29690

CONCERN Dog Size - Commenters suggest having on-leash and off-leash areas for small dogs separate from **STATEMENT:** those areas containing large dogs. In addition, intact dogs should be required to be on-leash at all times.

Representative **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s): 202

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

180621

Representative Quote: The only problems I see are with dogs who have not been spayed or neutered. Perhaps a less restrictive alternative would be to require that all intact dogs be on leash on GGNRA property.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

236

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

180767

Representative Quote: PLEASE like other places in the bay area and thruout the country, PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE, reserve some off leash spaces for SMALL dogs only and have them enclosed. There is no such area in san francisco.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

421

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181604

Representative Quote: Please consider an enclosed off-leash dog area, ideally with large and small dog sections, and keep the remainder of the park areas for on-leash use only. Sadly the actions of the few make off-leash dog use incompatible with high density mixed uses; no one should have fear of using the park. Yes the number of incidents is small statistically, but their impact and the cost of enforcement is great.

Concern ID: 29691

CONCERN Service Dogs -The park should require service dogs to be registered with the park and to wear a **STATEMENT:** jacket or leash that identified the service dog.

Representative **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s): 1493

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191301

Representative Quote: Over the last few months I have had several encounters with able-bodied

hikers on the main Tennessee Valley trail that claimed that their pets were "service animals" or therapy dogs and therefore, permitted on the trail. I am aware that service animals exist for disabilities other than visual or hearing impairment. However, there seems to be no system to prevent persons from abusing the privilege and claiming that any old mutt is a "service animal."

Disabled persons requesting special parking accommodations are required to register with the DMV after obtaining written verification of need from their physician. They must then display the special blue hangtag to utilize the special parking areas. It seems that a similar system of registration with physician verified need could be adapted for service animals. Once registered, the animal could wear a special jacket or leash that clearly identifies the animal as a service animal. Such identification of these animals would relieve the disabled person from the burden of having to justify the presence of their dog in a restricted area. It would also prevent non-disabled dog owners from thinking that it really is ok to have their pet there despite what the signs say.

Please consider implementation of a program to register and identify service animals in the GGNRA. If that is not possible, then consider posting signage defining acceptable service animals (ADA definition) and that it is illegal to misrepresent an animal as a service animal

Corr. ID: Organization: Wild Equity Institute
3815

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

226963

Representative Quote: There are a surprising number of fraudulent representations of dogs as "Service Dogs"

Concern ID: 29692

CONCERN Dog Waste - Commenters suggest that the park provide dog waste bags, compost areas, and a **STATEMENT:** means to convert dog waste to methane energy.

Representative **Corr. ID: Organization:** Not Specified

Quote(s): 1324

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195071

Representative Quote: If the rules and expectations are clearly posted and enforced, I do not think there will be any big problems. As a suggestion, the Park Service may want to consider having trash cans and plastic doggie mitts available for pet owners to use to pick up after their dogs. San Rafael provides this service and I never see any dog "droppings" on the streets or in the grass at the parks where these mitts are available.

Corr. ID: Organization: Not Specified

1483

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223787

Representative Quote: 2. Require and enforce people to clean up after their dogs.

Corr. ID: Organization: Not Specified

1696

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191111

Representative Quote: People should be held responsible to the rules that already exist regarding picking up poop. Perhaps supplying more bags - biodegradable would be best - & more can would help.

Corr. ID: Organization: Not Specified

2096

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

193337

Representative Quote: (1) Dog "Poops" in compostable bags

(2) Dispose in containers which will convert to methane = energy for power - i.e. -light posts, etc.
(as done in dog park in Boston!)

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2101

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

193348

Representative Quote: Provide public compostable poop bags in Park Areas.

Concern ID: 29693

CONCERN Leash Type - Commenters stated that the park should require dog walkers to carry a leash with **STATEMENT:** them at all times even when walking in a ROLA. Commenters also suggested the use of electronic leashes, remote training collars, and 12-foot leashes be allowed in lieu of the 6-foot leash.

Representative **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s): 458

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181732

Representative Quote: Consider the leashes bring their own risks for mixed use (tripping, falling, etc) and consider technological solutions as part of this. I urge you to consider remote training collars for dogs as the equivalent of an electronic collar that can achieve the benefits of control but allow greater freedom of movement for dogs and avoid some of the risks of leashes

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1483

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191258

Representative Quote: Here are several alternative solutions to closing trails and beaches. They are less expensive solutions for land management and people management:

1. Require and enforce people to CARRY leashes for their dogs. Monitor for voice control.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1935

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

192604

Representative Quote: - Consider electronic leash for on-leash areas.

-The same number of dogs in less space is a public danger

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4318

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209423

Representative Quote: My suggestion is that the GGNRA require all dogs to be on-leash, but that you request a waiver from the National Park Service from the current six foot leash requirement, and allow dogs to be on leashes up to 12 feet long, to allow more freedom to dog owners and their pets. A 12 foot leash permits a dog to run a little while still being under control by their owner. I also believe that the GGNRA should designate or develop two or more fenced off-leash dog areas on GGNRA lands in Marin County and in San Francisco, much like other

jurisdictions, so owners who want to run their dogs off-leash can do so in these areas. Examples of these fenced off-leash dog areas exist in Golden Gate Park and in my own town of Alameda.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4380

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209544

Representative Quote: The GGNRA could develop partnerships with community, animal welfare, and conservation organizations to make this work. These partner groups could bring additional resources to limited federal resources. For example, in partnership with dog-associated businesses, perhaps it would be possible to create an annual permit system that includes modest education requirements in order for regular off-leash dog use. I could see that something like this could generate revenue for the National Park Service or the Golden Gate Parks Conservancy.

Concern ID: 29694

CONCERN STATEMENT: Certification/Tag System - Commenters suggested establishing a certification that would allow visitors to show that they can control their dogs under voice and sight control. Visitors proving they have control over their dogs would receive a voice control tag to attach to the dog's collar which would allow them ROLA access. Training classes should be available to teach dogs how to behave within the park. This would eliminate unruly dogs at the park.

Representative Quote(s): Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

113

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181982

Representative Quote: I just wanted to request that you please allow for some beach access for dogs off leash. Another though I had was - perhaps you could partner w/ a dog trainer that could give classes to teach dog (and person) how to act responsible and considerate in the park. & maybe give certificates that would extend the off leash area for those specific certified dogs & person.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

377

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181163

Representative Quote: I am fully supportive of an off-leash licensing program which could be run by animal control. Off leash licenses could be given to responsible dog owners. Responsible dog owners do the following: 1) license their dogs. 2) Have their dogs take all the required shots. 3) Have their dogs complete a certified (could be by animal control) obedience program. 4) Spay their dogs. 5) Dog owners could be required to carry liability insurance for their dogs. 7) Of course responsible dog owners pick up their dog waste. 6) Dog owners would have to pay a fee to NPS for the privilege of walking dogs off leash. Those who have the license to walk off leash would have to carry proof of such licensing at all times.

I think this would reward responsible dog owners.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

407

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181573

Representative Quote: Instead of punishing the dogs that do behave on the trails why not set up a special license thru the Audubon Society or Humane Society. Dog owners could pay a small fee for a tag after they can prove their dog is under control by voice command. Dogs that can't pass have to be leashed.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

658

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

181513

Representative Quote: We urge that you require all dogs in areas where they are not explicitly allowed to be off-leash, to be always on-leash. If some dog owners are insistent that their animals can be fully controlled by voice commands, they should be required to demonstrate this by testing, under realistic conditions. (The owners of dogs should bear the full cost of the tests, and dogs that pass should be required to carry some form of identification, renewable annually for a fee.) The going-in assumption should be that voice-control does not work unless contrary proof is provided.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

753

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223798

Representative Quote: c) implement a voice control recall policy based on the honor system. (dog owners watch a short video online or at a local library, nps kiosk, station, city hall portraying voice control protocols). owners watch the video, agree that their dog abides by the recall system protocol, and pays annual fee (video will have to be watch annually before registration can be completed and fees paid) . dogs would be required to wear a voice control tag in addition to rabies and animal license or a citation, warning or actual will be given. boulder, colorado has a voice control/recall video and the program has been successful.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

913

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191323

Representative Quote: Another option would be to enforce dog licensing, and even charging an additional fee for screening dogs'/owners' behavior before issuing a "national park license", which could be required for use of these areas. I am a dog trainer and a psychiatrist and have been interested in developing guidelines for licensing service animals (particularly the largely unregulated "psychiatric service animal"). Something like this would also make sense for National Park use, charging a fee for a training session that would notify the dog owners of the rules and help ensure that they are followed, which would also weed out a lot of the destructive dogs and dog owners, who would be ticketed if they did not have their "national park license".

Corr. ID: Organization: Self

1445

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

199685

Representative Quote: I think dog walkers need to be licensed and required to attend classes on how to manage dogs in large packs. Limiting dog walkers to no more than 4 dogs would be a good first step plus requiring licenses and permits.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1632

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200215

Representative Quote: My principal source of exercise is walking my dogs off leash twice a day, so I have a very strong vested interest in retaining access to off-leash fire roads and trails. I am also, of course, seriously interested in maintaining the habitat of wildlife and the integrity of the environment.

Here are my recommendations:

Establish a "Voice and Sight" program that is in place in Boulder, CO, to give special identification and licensing to dogs that are under voice control.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1850

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

192067

Representative Quote: Comment: The Compliance-Based Management Strategy should be removed from the DEIS. It should be replaced with a strategy that rewards responsible dog walkers and bans irresponsible dog walkers, as follows:

i. Set up a permit/color tag system that would be partnered with local Animal Care and Control Departments. Dogs that have licenses from local ACC could be issued a permit, renewable annually, to walk in GGNRA sites. A small fee could be charged to help pay for processing. This would help with getting dogs licensed locally and support GGNRA efforts as well. A brightly colored collar tag for dog and ID for owner could be provided and required for visits to GGNRA. Only dogs/dog walkers with these permits would be able to use off leash play areas, as well as on leash areas. Dog walkers/dogs visiting for one day could obtain one day only permit from Gift Shops and Ranger Stations with different color tag allowing them on leash only access to GGNRA sites. Failure to observe restrictions would result in loss of permit for dog walking in GGNRA.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1879

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200475

Representative Quote: We need to consider that education is the solution to any conflict regarding dogs recreating off leash in the parks. The dog owners and the general public would benefit from education regarding dog safety both on and off leash and understanding of the statistics with regard to same.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2229

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200841

Representative Quote: Rather than spend so much \$ to enforce and create the amended off leash areas, why not educate and ensure that people have well trained dogs? For dogs to be off leash anywhere at any time, they should have a rocket recall. If you call them, they will come away or off of something ie. people, picnics, flora and fauna and back to you.

In addition to a dog license, dogs can be issued a tag which indicates that have passed a Canine Good Citizen test, which means the dog/human have been trained/passed a number of tests to ensure appropriate behavior in public. This would make for better managed, happier dogs and a happier community.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4651

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209010

Representative Quote: Offer special licensing for off-leash access. I understand that having dogs off-leash creates unique demands for the National Park Service. I am looking for ways to help you deal with them. One way to help fund the extra training, maintenance, and effort it puts on your organization is to have dog owners like me pay for it. I would happily pay a subscription fee to let my dog play off leash at Funston.

Concern ID: 29695

CONCERN Additional Alternatives - Commenters have suggested a new alternative which balances the **STATEMENT:**recreational needs of the Bay Area with the protection of natural resources, and/or adds more on-

leash and off-leash areas for dogs. The A+ alternative would include the 1979 Policy, with enforcement, and the addition of more dog walking areas available.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** **Organization:** *Not Specified*

1002

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191731

Representative Quote: I believe that the GGNRA is not truly taking into account what an off leash site means to dog owners. I am including what I think should be down. I do not agree with this plan at all!

The GGNRA should develop a new alternative, the A+ Alternative, that will better balance the recreational needs of the Bay Area with protection of natural resources. The DEIS calls the "No Change" Alternative "A". This is the 1979 Pet Policy with some restrictions, particularly restrictions on off-leash at Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, and Crissy Field because of the snowy plover and native plant restorations. More than one-third of Bay Area residents have dogs and we now know the importance of off-leash recreation for dog's physical and mental health, as well as the importance of the significant social communities that develop where people recreate with their dogs off-leash. The A+ Alternative would include everywhere that is currently off-leash, plus sufficient off-leash opportunities in San Mateo County to meet the demand, and more trails off-leash throughout the GGNRA. In addition, new land added to the GGNRA would include off-leash areas, especially in those areas where it has traditionally taken place. There would be no compliance-based management strategy in the A+ Alternative. Any dog management philosophy in the GGNRA, like that for any other recreation use, should be based on Bay Area values of co-existence, shared space, collaboration among park user groups, and education where problems arise. Enforcement of already existing regulations should target irresponsible dog owners who create the few problems documented by the GGNRA, while allowing responsible dog owners to continue their traditional off-leash recreation without harassment.

Corr. ID: **Organization:** *Not Specified*

1267

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

194978

Representative Quote: After reviewing the DEIS, none of the alternatives are appealing. A new alternative must be created. One that creates more off leash areas for dogs. It only seems fair that both sides of the issues are presented to the public. By leaving out a pro-dog alternative, the public is forced to choose between bad and worse. Please create a new alternative that champions off leash dog recreation. Then let us comment once again.

Corr. ID: **Organization:** *Not Specified*

1391

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195297

Representative Quote: Instead I would suggest increasing off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA to more than 1% not reducing them. Currently the GGNRA's limit deters dog owners and their friends from visiting these lands, which we ALL pay for in taxes, and should have right to access.

Corr. ID: **Organization:** *Not Specified*

2213

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200741

Representative Quote: Currently less than 1% of the GGNRA allows off-leash recreation, and now the GGNRA wants to reduce that even further. Is it too much to ask that we retain the usage of this small amount of space as it has been for many, many years? I propose the GGNRA should develop a NEW alternative, that would not only KEEP the current areas off-leash, but also lead to development of ADDITIONAL off-leash areas in new land obtained by the GGNRA. The

GGNRA should be expanding not reducing off-leash locations.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

3885

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

206015

Representative Quote: I support a modified Alternative A (the "No Action alternative") that codifies the 1979 Pet Policy as it was originally written, and that includes off- and on-leash access on GGNRA lands in San Mateo and on new lands that become part of the GGNRA, especially those areas in both that have traditionally had dog walking.

Concern ID: 30111

CONCERN Time Restrictions - Commenters suggest requiring time restrictions throughout the park for when **STATEMENT:**ROLAs, on-leashing dog walking, and no dog walking would be allowed. Time restrictions could be based on week vs. weekday hours, season hours, or hours for morning and night use.

Representative Quote(s): Corr. ID: Organization: California Parks Association

1227

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

194877

Representative Quote: 2.Dogs allowed only before 10 A.M. and after 5 P.M.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1277

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195001

Representative Quote: We want part of the beaches to be off leash every day. I am open to the dogs being leashed at certain times (like peak use times) and say between 8am to 11am it is off leash. 11am to 5pm on leash and 5-7 off leash.

Concern ID: 30116

CONCERN Signs - Commenters suggest posting signs/guidelines to educate visitors when and where off- **STATEMENT:**leash dogs are allowed at the park.

Representative Quote(s): Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2654

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195448

Representative Quote: How are people to know which areas to avoid if there is no guidance? Many fences signs are currently deteriorating or covered up by sand dunes or non-existent. This leads to what I see as one of the biggest problems with the destruction of restored habitat, which is mostly people entering existing restored areas where they should not be. I see families set up with on restored dunes and watch as two and four-legged creatures dig into the dunes or trample over the native plants. People would be less apt to do this if there were signs letting them know the work that has been done to such areas and how sensitive the landscape is.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2888

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

202936

Representative Quote: Therefore, regardless of what actions and changes are made, There should be several large signs placed with clear "magic" language stating usage guidelines at all GGNRA park locations. Specifically, at the highly populated multi-use areas, there could also be a "you are here" map & some directionals as to access to the spot's treasures

Corr. ID: Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

4223

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

208947

Representative Quote: The draft plan has the effect of punishing many people because a very small number are uneducated, insensitive, or irresponsible and because the current signage of off leash areas is unclear. The reasonable response to this problem is to educate visitors, improve signage and help park visitors follow the rules and learn how to respect the environment, not to ban the rest of us with dogs from the GGNRA. I wish that the DEIS would include an alternative along these lines.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4592

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

223783

Representative Quote: 3) Provide better website information, and signage at the park.

? Inform people there is off-leash dog recreation at specific parks. Although dogs are prominent at Fort Funston, one would never know that by reading the NPS website on Fort Funston. Based on the website information, a dog-phobic person would be unpleasantly surprised when he arrived at Fort Funston. By setting realistic expectations, visitor conflicts could be reduced.

Concern ID: 31337

CONCERN Split the beaches- Commenters suggested that half of the beaches in the plan be set up for those who enjoy dogs, and half be set up for those who do not like dogs

STATEMENT:who enjoy dogs, and half be set up for those who do not like dogs

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

2056

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

193310

Representative Quote: This is an all or nothing plan. Why not just dedicate 1/2 the beaches to those scared of dogs and 1/2 the beaches to dog lovers? - or drop this plan all together -

Concern ID: 31395

CONCERN Commenters suggested that if dog walkers would like to have 1% of the GGNRA open to dogs, conservationists would be allowed to pick what 1% of the lands would be open to dogs.

STATEMENT:conservationists would be allowed to pick what 1% of the lands would be open to dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon

3606

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

203954

Representative Quote: I see that the Dog Owners Groups are calling for "Their 1%" of access to recreate their dog's off-leash. One minor point here is that of the entire park only about 3% is open even to humans so that would be about 1/3 of space shared with off-leash dogs. Indeed it is practically every trail. While I strongly disagree with the entitlement mentality of their demand I suggest an easy solution: let the conservationists pick which areas that 1% can be. There won't be much beach access.

Concern ID: 31412

CONCERN The GGNRA should release the General Management Plan and GGNRA foundation statement to allow for the public to understand the intent of the project by NPS.

STATEMENT:allow for the public to understand the intent of the project by NPS.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*

3945

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

227091

Representative Quote: Before publishing the revised Dog Management Plan, complete and

publish the GGNRA Foundation Statement and the GGNRA General Management Plan to provide full disclosure of the Park Services' understanding and intent for the GGNRA and to allow for meaningful communication to the public about the full extent of the GGNRA's plans for recreation.

Concern ID: 31533

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggested that NPS provide an exception that would allow those with disabilities to have their dogs off-leash in areas where dogs are allowed on leash, assuming they were under voice control.

Representative Quote(s): 4660
Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

227441

Representative Quote: Provide special compensations for people with disabilities by allowing them to have well- behaved, voice control dogs on any trail that allows on-leash dogs

Concern ID: 31543

CONCERN STATEMENT: Areas formerly opened to off-leash dog recreation in the GGNRA should be reopened for user access. These areas need to be reexamined, and only remain closed if an adverse impact is shown.

Representative Quote(s): 4697
Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

227449

Representative Quote: All areas identified in the GGNRA Pet Policy brochure as existing in early 2000 as off leash areas should remain off leash. To the extent any of those areas are deemed currently closed to dogs, they should be opened. The Crissy Field beach area between the Coast Guard pier and the rock area that is the current boundary for dog use should be reopened to dogs consistent with the Mitigation Matrix of the Crissy Field NSI finding.

The closure areas at Fort Funston should be reopened for user access including dog walking access absent a well founded showing of significant adverse environmental impact. The traditional off leash area on the Lands End road and path leading along the coastal cliffs should be reopened, subject to closure of certain areas away from the roadway in the event of a well founded showing of adverse environmental impact. The Ocean Beach off leash restrictions from Stairwell 21 to Sloat should be reexamined and remain restricted only if there is analysis showing a substantial basis to believe that the restriction will aid the Snowy Plover population. Any such restriction should be limited to the seasons when and areas where the Snowy Plovers are ordinarily present.

Concern ID: 31772

CONCERN STATEMENT: The alternatives that have been dismissed should be reconsidered.

Representative Quote(s): 4035
Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

227704

Representative Quote: All "Alternatives Suggested and Dismissed from Consideration" need to be re-evaluated considering the recreational value of the park, valid scientific monitoring and measurement of incremental impacts from dog recreation, and the recognition that some impacts are justified to support the recreational mandate and to maintain recreational opportunities for this and future generations.

Concern ID: 31855

CONCERN It has been suggested that [regardless of the alternative selected] clear signage, better fencing, **STATEMENT:** and/or more enforcement will still be required to protect listed species at GGNRA.

Representative **Corr. ID:** **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s): 4584

Comment**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

210026

Representative Quote: Crissy Field WPA ' The DEIS indicates that the east boundary fence will be relocated 200 feet eastward at a position 900 feet from the NOAA pier (p. 60). The language of the plan should allow the National Park Service flexibility in determining the exact location of the fence and consideration should be given to the visual penetration effect as well as the geographical conditions of the immediate area.

Under the preferred alternative, off-leash dog activity directly adjacent to the east boundary fence will pose a visual threat that will penetrate into the Wildlife Protection Area, effectively rendering a portion of the eastern WPA as non-viable habitat during daytime use hours. Given this concern, the fence should be placed a reasonable distance eastward, beyond the actual 900 foot border line, to allow for an adequate buffer zone.

Additionally, the geography of the area of fence placement is somewhat complicated by non-uniform conditions which include a variety of substrates, varying elevations, several lobes of fenced dune habitat areas, and a variety of pedestrian pathways. Consideration should be given to all of these conditions and fence placement should be such that will accommodate ease of pedestrian traffic flow while maintaining adequate protection of the WPA.

When installed, the fence should extend to the water at extreme low tide

Concern ID: 31864

CONCERN Dogs should be leashed year-round in snowy plover protection areas to avoid confusion that leads **STATEMENT:** to non-compliance. These leash requirements will require good enforcement, as no laws are currently enforced.

Representative **Corr. ID:** **Organization:** San Francisco State University

Quote(s): 1902

Comment**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

200433

Representative Quote: I would like to see the requirement that dogs must be on leash all 12 months of the year in the Snowy Plover Protection Areas. This will avoid the current confusion. I have talked to many people who were confused as to what time of year there was a leash requirement on Ocean Beach and who did not leash their dogs because of the confusion. The leash requirements must also be enforced, as they are not currently enforced in any adequate manner.

Concern ID: 31919

CONCERN It was suggested that a volunteer rescue crew could be assembled as part of the mitigation at Fort **STATEMENT:** Funston to relieve park staff of commitments to rescues in the area.

Representative **Corr. ID:** **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s): 4666

Comment**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

227791

Representative Quote: The DEIS uses the fact that dogs and people have to sometimes be rescued as a reason to limit dogs, say in the rescue attempts can cause injuries to park law

enforcement (p. 19). It does not discuss an option for allowing a volunteer rescue team to be formed that could be called first, to relieve law enforcement from this obligation. This should be discussed and explored as mitigation in the FEIS. Now that I know that it's such a burden on law enforcement, I will avoid calling them for any assistance I might need when on GGNRA lands.

AL1010 - Suggest an Alternative that has Been Dismissed

Concern ID: 31367

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggested that rather than banning dogs for the entire day, dogs should be allowed in restricted areas during certain times of day, such as non-peak times. Another suggestion was seasonal restrictions, which would help protect sensitive areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2941

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202408 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My 1st concern is that most people do not use the areas at all times and therefore there are periods of the day and week off-leash dog walking could be allowed and should not be banned for ALL periods. Currently, I walk my dog several times a week in the GGNRA. I often do this at non-peak times in the evenings during daylight savings at Land's End and on Friday Morning at Chrissy field. Often times, my dog and I are the only users or of the few users of these places.

Corr. ID: 3560 **Organization:** Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Comment ID: 203487 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Overall I am not a supporter of banning dogs out right from the GGNRA. It is a park for all of us and for the most part dog owners are responsible. While I understand a plan to have the GGNRA inline w/other NPS sites- the GGRNA is different from almost all other NPS sites. It is a collection of different parcels- some urban so rural that have been patched together. My wife and I are supports of the GGNRA through the Parks Conservancy because we want to support a park for all.

I do believe that most dog owners are responsible, and I can understand restrictions on so many dogs per person as one way to help out with the concerns of this EIS. I also would support seasonal closures of sensitive sites (i.e. during breeding seasons) but not full closure.

As for trail use, and we are avid trail hikers with our dogs in the Marin Headlands. If there are concerns about trail use, I would argue that horses and mountain bikers cause more damage to trails than dogs ever will.

I understand your daunting tasks, but I hope that you will preserve the concept of the parks for all users.

AL5000 - Comments on Dog walking Permit System

Concern ID: 29674

CONCERN STATEMENT: No Change - Keep existing regulations and permitting requirements for individual and commercial dog walkers as they are now. There is no need to alter the restrictions on commercial dog walking. Alternative E also provides beneficial rules regarding commercial dog walking.

- Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1210 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 194855 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Commercial dog walkers should be allowed. I strongly prefer Alternative E for dog walkers because it offers good, solid rules for what they can and cannot do and the rules are restrictive enough.
- Corr. ID:** 1598 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 190834 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I walk with dogs and I am a dog walker. The happiest time in our day is when the dogs & I are recreating and playing at the beach and GGNRA! Without our park area- we would not have exercised- socialized mellow dogs. We are a true community of people who live for our dogs. To limit the amount of dogs would take way my livelihood and people rely on me to care for their loving pets when they work or travel. We are wondering why you must take back what you gave to us and why put a limit when all is going just fine for the last 15 years.
- Corr. ID:** 2104 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193359 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: If you are going to enforce leash laws why not just enforce the more narrow laws we have now. Increase fines for not picking up after dog. Enforce walker license laws & restrictions on # of dogs they can take.
- Corr. ID:** 2108 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193368 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Rules + regulations that are already in place should be enforced (as a helpful solution) instead of curtailing use to all- mostly responsible - people. I am a dogwalker + I am for requiring permits, requiring picking up poop & dog behavior management.
- Concern ID:** 29675
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commercial Fees - Commercial dog walkers should pay some kind of use fee for walking dogs at the park. This use fee could be implemented through daily permits, monthly permits, or yearly permits. Amounts suggested ranged from a small daily fee to several thousand dollars for commercial dog walkers. This would help raise revenue for enforcement and maintenance. Commercial dog walkers should also be required to be registered, insured, and bonded if using the park for their services.
- Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 631 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182497 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Finally commercial dog walkers should be required to have a permit (\$500/month) to walk dogs in the GGNRA. They should also be required to wear identifying clothes such as a shirt with the dog walking company name or their own name if they are self-employed.

Corr. ID: 694

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182682

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: All professional dog walkers should be required to have a permit to walk their dogs off leash or on leash. The must pay per dog. If they wish to get a permit to walk 2 dogs this means they pay \$3,455x2 a year. If they wish to walk 4 dogs (should be the max), this means they pay \$3,455x4 a year. Could consider increasing the cost given that they are a business. Also if the park decides that they want to let commercial dog walkers have more than 4 dogs, the cost for each additional dog over 4 should be \$4982 an extra dog.

Corr. ID: 1232

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194887

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial dog walking--which has become a most lucrative venture at around \$20 an hour per dog -- has impeded our family's ability to enjoy our public space. Some walkers are 'in charge' of 10-11 dogs, who are off leash and galloping along madly, easily able to tackle and topple little kids. A further concern for health and safety is the urine and feces that is halfheartedly picked up. Understandable, because how can one walker meticulously clean up after 10 dogs, no matter how conscientious? [even if they are making \$200 an hour.] Management of this situation is absolutely crucial. I support the proposed regulations but would beg for more stringent ones: a) limit the number of dogs to the walker, to 3 dogs per walker; b) certify/license dog walkers; c) enforce IRS and State income tax requirements, and SF City&County business license fees; d)do not allow dogs to roam free at any point on the Crissy Field beach, for the reasons stated above [Crissy beaches are the safest beaches for children; children should be provided priority access and protected from dogs.] e)fence in other non-beach area selected for dogs to roam off-leash; f)conduct close monitoring of dog walkers and ticketing walkers who fail to meticulously clean up after the dogs.

Corr. ID: 3918

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205688

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: All professional dog walkers using the parks should be licensed and bonded and be ready to show proof when asked by a ranger. No professional dog walker should have a group of off leash dogs with them with a dog/person ratio higher than 4:1. All professional dog walkers should apply annually for a license to use the GGNRA parks. At that time, they should present their state license and bond and pay an annual user fee of \$100. This money should go toward the maintenance of the parks.

Corr. ID: 4070

Organization: Mar Vista Stables

Comment ID: 207680

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2)Commercial Dog Walking-On most public lands, any commercial entity making money off of use of those lands usually has to pay a permit or lease fee to the agency responsible for those lands (BLM- OHV races, Livestock grazing, mining, etc.; US Bureau of Reclamation-houseboat rentals, jet ski rentals, marinas, campsites, etc.). It seems that an entity bringing multiple dogs to NPS lands and making money off of that without having to assist in the upkeep of that area (financially or otherwise) is unfair to the rest of the general public using those lands and strains agency resources. This should be a general requirement on commercial dog walking in all GGNRA lands for all Alternatives (including the No Action alternative).

Corr. ID: 4408

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206411

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In my opinion, commercial dog walkers need to be licensed, and should pay a business tax. I know that this is being considered by the supervisors in SF. They should be able to walk only a limited number of dogs. In my opinion, I think 6 dogs should be a maximum. (Picture trying to pick up the dog waste from 10 dogs.) Looking on the web, commercial dog walkers in San Francisco charge between \$350 to almost \$400 per month for walking one dog on weekdays (20 clients at \$370 per month = \$89,000/yr). Food trucks in our public parks in SF pay for being there. It seems that dog walkers using our public spaces for their businesses should also.

Corr. ID: 4436 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209344 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Professional dog walkers need to be registered, insured and bonded for public safety. Paying a user fee is not off the table. Special Bright collars for registered dogs and pin on visual permits for walkers may be useful.

Concern ID:

29676

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Dog owners and commercial walkers should be licensed issued by the park, a separate entity, or the city in order to take dogs off-leash. Suggestions for this included that dogs would need to have all appropriate shots and other city requirements, would need to take a dog training or obedience class, a class on dog walking and park education, and tests for voice control proficiency. It was suggested that commercial dog walking is a business and needs to be regulated in the same manner as other vendors in the park, including taxation and fees.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4642 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208836 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Proposal for Permitted Off Leash Dog Access Within Selected Areas of GGNRA

1. Individuals would obtain an annual permit that would allow them to have up to three dogs off leash in the areas of GGNRA where ROLA is currently allowed.
2. Obtaining a permit would require demonstration of acceptable voice control for at least one dog and payment of an annual fee (\$100 suggested). This fee would offset the permitting process as well as support the trail maintenance in GGNRA.
3. Demonstration of acceptable voice control would require that the applicant be able to call their dog away from two leashed stranger dogs before contact has occurred. This "test" could be performed by licensed pet dog trainers or other professionals designated by GGNRA.
4. Those individuals who have obtained an off leash permit would be required, when accompanied by their off-leash dogs, to wear a nylon vest issued by GGNRA. This vest would have a large identification number that could be noted by others on the trails.
5. An infraction of off-leash rules (unwanted dog or human interaction, not picking up after their dog) would be grounds for a significant fine and/or suspension of the permit. Note that infractions could be reported by anyone on the trail, not requiring the presence of a Park Ranger.

This policy would have a number of positive consequences, including:

1. Continued access by those individuals able to demonstrate standards of responsible dog ownership
2. Ability to hold permitted individuals accountable for their dog's behavior without the need for patrolling by Rangers.
3. Encouraging awareness, training and control of dogs by those wishing to obtain a permit
4. Financial support for trails and park maintenance by those who actively use the parks and who have a vested interest in their welfare.

Concern ID: 29678

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Increase in Number of Dogs - The number of dogs that commercial dog walkers are allowed to walk in the parks should be increased. The proposed limitations will negatively impact the income of dog walkers, who depend on this as their livelihood.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 58 **Organization:** Tailblazers Dog Walking & Pet Services

Comment ID: 181791 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do, however, NOT agree to limiting dog walkers to 6 dogs. If we have to pay for a permit, we should at least be legal at 8 dogs. There essentially putting a cap on what we can make. I'll lose well over \$30K per year with this change.

Corr. ID: 191 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182303 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding the limit of dogs for the Professional walkers (licensed, trained, insured walkers), I strongly support that up to 8 dogs per walk is fine for those licensed professionals. I am fine with any additional licensing for each individual dog.

Corr. ID: 1376 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195249 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Allowing only 3 dogs per dog walker would apply a tourniquet to the income of these valued local, small businesses. If a number - must- be applied to limiting the amount of dogs to ease the burden of their environmental impact, I suggest the limit be increased to at least 6 dogs.

Corr. ID: 1607 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190847 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a professional dog walker I am happy to apply for a permit and am in favor of some regulation! But please reconsider the number of dogs to 8 at the very least. It would be economically unfeasible to stay in business walking only 6 dogs.

Also, please allow us to walk from the parking lot to the beach with the dogs off-leash. There is no way we could safely walk to the beach with all the dogs on leash.

Corr. ID: 1611 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190851 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -Puts an unfair burden monetarily on dog walkers and those that own more than 3 dogs.

-Your commercial dog walking Alternatives will put a lot of people out of work - IE- 6 dog limit. This will impact the local economy- which I see is not noted anywhere

Corr. ID: 3565 **Organization:** Self

Comment ID: 203559 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are indeed a few who spoil the situation, but the proposed new Plan severely regulates (punishes) thousands of dog lovers who are very considerate with their pets. I have lived in major parts of the United States, and the Bay Area is fortunate to have organized dogwalking groups that host monthly clean up activities in major park areas. Please note that there is not the same level of attention for Horse riders, beach- and park- attendees who damage grounds with inconsiderate trash (and horse remains) throughout Ocean Beach, GG Park, and various Marin beaches.

If the GGNRA was most concerned about environmental impact, it would severely

fine those who litter (this is not enforced today) - ; invest in more trash receptacles and disposal management; and perhaps consider a for-fee membership system for dog areas to help maintain and preserve the areas. For those in the dog-walking profession, a limit of 8 dogs (not 3) is a proven management number where they can keep an eye on dogs for refuse cleanup.

To encourage more environmental protection, areas can be (are, and have been) cordoned off to allow for regrowth; this has proven an effective measure, and this could continue. Sections could be rotated for regrowth throughout park areas. Dog owners would stick to cordoned off or restrictive areas if more signs were posted. Again, fines or violations help enforce this, and noting this on your signs would be a very blatant way of ensuring enforcement. Should you accept these suggestions as a compromise, you could meet with the dogwalker community to encourage dogwalkers to self-regulate (call out violators) -- which I know they would do. We want to curb the "bad apples" in the bunch as much as you do.

Corr. ID: 4567 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209913 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The following comments are with regards to the Alta Trail, Orchard Fire Road and Pacheco Fire Road:

It is true that this area is visited by many commercial dog walkers, some of whom walk many dogs off leash at the same time. I believe that it is reasonable to cap the number of off-leash dogs per person but turning this area into on-leash only with a maximum of 3 dogs (or 6 dogs with a permit) per dog walker is too drastic and erpunative. What is the goal? Getting rid of commercial dog walkers on the fire roads between Marin City and Oakwood Valley?

Concern ID:

29679

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Decrease in Number of Dogs - The number of dogs that commercial dog walkers are allowed to walk in the parks should be decreased. The proposed restrictions would not provide adequate protection of resources or result in changes to current issues. Another option suggested was that the size of the dog should be factored into the number of dogs allowed.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 928 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191387 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Also, there should be a limit of 3 (or 2)dogs per person, or even different rules based on size (consider the relative impact of two 15-pound dogs as compared to two fifty-pound dogs). It is not appropriate for the Park Service to create commercial permits for professional dog walkers. The laxer the GGNRA and other agencies are about the numbers of dogs per walker, the more people are encouraged to bring multiple dogs.

Corr. ID: 1829 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191953 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The idea of dog walkers having 6 dogs "under control" even on leashes is an illusion, and of course the excrement left in their wake is a detriment to the environment, not to mention an annoyance to non-dog owning walkers who follow.

Please tighten up on the restrictions for dog owners and dog walkers in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3196 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203845 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please protect our precious San Francisco ecology by requiring dogs in the park to be on leash and by limiting the number of dogs a single person can bring into the park.

I feel Strongly that commercial dog walkers are abusing our parks. As a frequent visitor to the Presidio, I encounter many groups of six to twelve off-leash dogs in all areas of the park, "led" by dog walkers who in reality have no control over the animals.

Although I love dogs, and have four of my own ranging from 80-100 pounds, it does not seem fair or appropriate for commercial operators to allow their paid-for charges to run rampant in public parks where they threaten native wildlife and plants, as well as adults and children.

At the very least, these commercial operators should be limited to four on-leash dogs (the maximum one person can truly manage) in specific areas of the park. Also, it should be stressed that these pets should be on-leash, not under voice control in most areas. In real life, "voice" is not control, especially when the voice is not the owner of the pet, but a daily or weekly friend. Dog walkers, and possibly their employers, should be held accountable for infringements of park policies. Also, like other park vendors do, dog walkers should have to purchase a license to operate in the park.

These funds could be used to enforce the regulations and maintain the dog-access areas.

Corr. ID: 4001

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206241

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At the very least, these commercial operators should be limited to four on-leash dogs (the maximum one person can truly manage) in specific areas of the park.

They should be held accountable for infringements of park policies and, as other park vendors do, should have to purchase a license to operate in the park.

These funds could be used to enforce the regulations and maintain the dog-access areas.

Corr. ID: 4224

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208959

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully support efforts to reduce the number of dogs that 1 person can walk at a time. I have seen some professional dog walkers with 12 dogs at a time. In recent years the number of professional dog walkers using the areas has greatly increased and I do not believe that they can possibly keep more than 4 or 5 dogs in their sight and under voice control at all times. Nor do I find it credible that they are picking up all the dog poop.

Corr. ID: 4584

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210018

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Park visitors should be limited to one dog per visitor. On trails, visitors with more than one dog have a wider space requirement and have the potential to impact other park visitors by impeding their progress along the trail. In ROLAs, it is not practical to allow voice control of more than one dog per person. With few exceptions, dog handlers are not capable of managing more than one off-leash dog at a time.

Concern ID:

29680

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Applying these restrictions will not improve current issues with commercial dog walking in the GGNRA. In fact, the proposed limitations would actually aggravate the negative impacts of commercial dog walkers in the parks. Restrictions would

Representative Quote(s): *require unnecessary management and it would be difficult to ensure compliance.*
Corr. ID: 843 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186220 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Also, the pack size limits are going to increase the number of walkers/packs, and some of the really good walkers will find other ways to pay the bills when they can no longer make ends meet because of the size restrictions. This will make room for more inexperienced, low wage employee walkers. With experienced owner operators dropping in number, and inexperienced employees taking their place. Quality of care is not likely to be going up as a result of the new plan. I'm not in favor of huge groups, but making a living with 6 dog groups is going to necessitate a raise in rates that will most likely be unworkable, since there will be large operations with underpaid employees who are able to run enough trucks to do things at the old rates

Corr. ID: 1104 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192288 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am deeply disappointed by this effort to severely curtail off leash dog walking areas by the GGNRA. If the GGNRA draft dog management plan is passed, there will be a number of serious negative impacts... 1. My dog walker, although he does not go to the beaches on a work day basis, will be directly impacted because the many dog walkers who do take their clients to the beach will no longer be able to do so, and will therefore go to the already limited enclosed dog park areas. As a result, his normal parks will become overcrowded. 2. My local dog park area will become increasingly overcrowded, thus increasing the likelihood of an possible incident, as well as noise and management difficulties.

3. If there are limitations of 3 dogs/dogwalker, walkers will be forced to limit their time and schedule with their clients. As a result, each dog will receive less time outdoors, and possibly be scheduled at increasingly unreasonable times. This will lead to less exercised, more neurotic dogs in the neighborhood, and will be detrimental to everyone.

Corr. ID: 1621 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190865 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The regulation of dog pack numbers will not decrease traffic at the Parks. It will only encourage more dog walkers doing more walks per day, not to mention the dog owners that cannot afford to have their dogs walked professionally. This, I believe, will lead to dirtier parks and more chaos and confrontation than less.

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192049 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS fails to provide any support for limiting the number of dogs per walker to six. The DEIS should be changed to permit up to eight dogs per walker, Most responsible commercial dog walkers can and do handle up to 8 dogs.

- Restricting number of dogs per walker unreasonably will result in higher fees charged by dog walkers and potentially fewer responsible, well trained dog walkers to handle the demand.

- Comment: The DEIS fails to provide support for limiting the space for commercial dog walking, particularly since the DEIS lacks any numerical assessment of number of dogs affected. The DEIS should be changed to give commercial dog walkers adequate dog exercise areas. The Plan provides very limited space for commercial dog walkers, contributing further to the overcrowding issues.

The DEIS fails to address the severe effects on the local community from its commercial dog walking plan. The DEIS should be changed to address and to take

into account the effects of its policy on local residents.

? Commercial dog walking is an important business in San Francisco employing many residents

Access to commercial dog walking is also extremely important for many residents who work and cannot get home to exercise a dog(s) confined to an apartment and/or small back yard.

Corr. ID: 4017 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206851 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am in favor of any plan which:

3. Contains no restrictions or permits for dog walking within the GGNRA. This would require too much management and would be difficult for visitors to comply with.

Concern ID:

29681

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Restrictions to commercial dog walkers should be aligned with the local city and county regulations, rather than with separate regulations implemented by the Park Service.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 288 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181014 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The same goes for commercial dog walkers that have too many dogs for one person to control. Try limiting the number of dogs per person to whatever the county limit per household is - that way you don't have one person with 10 dogs that aren't necessarily under control.

Corr. ID: 3219 **Organization:** Portuguese Water Dog Club of Northern California

Comment ID: 226943 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: * Enable professional dog walking and align any professional dog walking rules with county or city regulations.

Corr. ID: 3931 **Organization:** The Whole Pet

Comment ID: 205808 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding professional dog walkers, San Francisco Animal Care & Control already has an existing list of guidelines for professional dog walkers in terms of the maximum number of dogs per walker, maintaining voice control or leashes, scooping poop, preventing digging & chasing etc. Most responsible dog walkers have already voluntarily agreed to follow these guidelines & are in favor of regulation, but there is not enough education or enforcement about these policies either.

Corr. ID: 4406 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205577 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Park Service should revise the dog management plan to:

- Enable professional dog walking and align any professional dog walking rules with county or city regulations.

Corr. ID: 4700 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227460 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: [Comment was originally presented at BOS committee hearing 4-11-11 by Sarah Ballard, Parks & Rec]

The EIS ' the, the environmental study of the proposed management plan ' also references limiting the number of dogs that professional dog walkers are allowed to have with them at any time, and floats the idea of creating a permit program or

training for dog walkers. The city does not currently have either of those, either of those things in place. And while they are ideas that, that have been discussed at a variety of points in time at our commission and elsewhere, it could be problematic if there were ' for, for residents and citizens ' if there are different rules in different jurisdictions. And so it is our hope that as a part of this, presents an opportunity for the department and the city to work, to continue to work collaboratively with the GGNRA to make any of those proposals as seamless as, as possible.

AN1000 - Comments on ANPR

There were no comments on AN1000

AT1100 - Alta Trail: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29722

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the preferred alternative for Alta Trail. While visitors felt off-leash dog walking may be appropriate at other sites, the Preferred Alternative at Alta allows visitors to recreate (i.e., running) without encountering off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1260 **Organization:** Golden Gate National Parks

Comment ID: 194961 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm sure it is wonderful for people with dogs to let them run free. I'd like the same freedom, and to be able to run without being harrassed by dogs. As I said, voice control is a joke. I think it's great to have designated off-leash areas, but I think Alta Trail should not be one of them. I support Alternative C.

AT1200 - Alta Trail: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29723

CONCERN STATEMENT: The preferred alternative for Alta Trail is unacceptable because it does not allow off-leash dog walking. Most of the visitors who use Alta Trail go there for exercise, which includes exercising their dogs off-leash. These visitors questioned the justification for changing to on-leash dog walking, as dog owners and walkers who use the trail are very responsible and respectful of both the environment and the wildlife in this habitat.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29237 (OV1300), Comment 190785 and Concern 29235 (OV1200), Comment 201098.

Concern ID: 29724

CONCERN STATEMENT: The preferred alternative for Alta Trail is unacceptable because it is not based on actual data. The environmental impacts are largely unfounded, and are not the result of off-leash dog walking, but other factors. The plan/EIS did not look at the impacts of mountain bikers and hikers at Alta Trail.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29237 (OV1300), Comment 190785 and Concern 29235 (OV1200), Comment 201098.

AT1300 - Alta Trail: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29725

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters supported alternative A at Alta Trail so as to maintain current access and opportunities. They prefer alternative A because the primary recreation activity

at Alta is off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s): For representative quotes, please see Concern 29237 (OV1300), Comment 190785.
Corr. ID: 2126 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 193409 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Why not make Alta Trail off-leash. It seems appropriate.
Corr. ID: 4687 **Organization:** County of Marin Dept. of Parks and Open Space
Comment ID: 227454 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental
Representative Quote: The Alta Trail is well used and much relied upon for residents of Marin City and Sausalito. Its proximity to these communities makes it an important destination for daily exercise for people and pets. Historical use from these populous and topographically constrained areas has had an adverse impact on the natural resources. However, these attributes make this trail a candidate for continued off leash use. Comments to the county about the proposed change to leash- required have been pointed and frequent. The county requests that this trail remain designated off leash to serve these communities.

Concern ID: 29726
CONCERN STATEMENT: Alternative D should be chosen at Alta Trail.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29551 (FB1300), Comment 29551.

AT1400 - Alta Trail: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29727
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggested a plan that connects Oakwood Valley Fire Road with Alta Trail to better accommodate more users by the creation of a loop. A longer, more vigorous loop would allow for more exercise for both humans and dogs.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29241 (OV1400), Comment 193288.

Concern ID: 29728
CONCERN STATEMENT: Have commercial dog walkers limited to 6 dogs off-leash on Alta. Otherwise other areas of the county will be affected.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2126 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 193410 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Alta --> make commercial dog walkers permitted to 6 dogs off-leash. Otherwise the proposed regulation will push this to another area (of the county, etc).

Concern ID: 29729
CONCERN STATEMENT: More education, better signage, and more fencing could improve the Alta area for humans, dogs, and the Mission blue butterfly. The current signage and restrictions are mostly followed, but and any problems could be addressed by more signage or better fencing.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3215 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 202570 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Another loop of key importance to our neighborhood is accessed through the Fernwood Cemetary and comes out at the fire road near the water tank on the Alta trail. This historically has been a great source for walking dogs off leash along the Alta trail and then connecting to the upper portion of the

Oakwood Valley Trail, then continuing down through Oakwood Valley fire road and out to Tennessee Valley for the return.. This longer, more vigorous loop is ideal for getting good exercise for both humans and dogs. It is consistently used, but I would not say it is overused. I am aware there is Mission Blue butterfly habitat along a stretch of the Alta trail and it is marked off and signed. Most people respect and pay attention to this. Perhaps a few don't. Again, education, better signage and perhaps more fencing could improve this for both humans and dogs and the butterfly. But in my 25+ years of experience walking these trails, I haven't seen any negative impact from dogs on lupine plants in this area. I have seen negative impacts from humans, and certainly from Scotch Broom. Is there any true science that shows negative impact from dogs in this area? Or is the impact from other sources?

My main concern is with the closing of these two key loops in the Oakwood Valley area. I highly recommend that these important loops be kept open and available to people with dogs. I have not seen any evidence in the DEIS that shows why these areas should not be open to dogs as currently used.

AW1000 - Animal Welfare: Impact on/to dogs

Concern ID: 29709

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters oppose off-leash restrictions because their dog will not be able to enjoy the park the same if leashes are required or if fenced in play is the only option (which is sometimes stressful for dogs).

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1155 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192901 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I dog not take my dogs to fenced-in dog play areas. My dogs find them stressful and I see more problems in those areas then I have ever seen at Fort Funston. I strongly believe that is what would happen at Fort Funston as well if the dogs are forced to stay in smaller, confined spaces.

Corr. ID: 2354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195373 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: But we visit not only the GGNRA lands in our neighborhood, but also Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Rodeo Beach, Muir Beach and many of the trails in the bluffs and hills above those places. I can't begin to imagine the huge negative impact the Preferred Alternative will have on my enjoyment of these areas. My dog is very active and requires at least some off-leash running to enjoy life. To keep him on-leash *all* the time, or to be forced to drive to small, crowded, enclosed off-leash areas in the SF city parks would seriously curtail my enjoyment of the GGNRA recreation areas as well as my dog's health and well-being.

Concern ID: 29710

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that requiring leashes as suggested in the DEIS, creates more aggressive behavior in dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 215 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180676 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Mandatory dog leashing at dog parks is not an alternative "solution" to the problem. In fact it creates more tension, more potential for aggressive behavior and deters from the enjoyment of both dog and owner.

Corr. ID: 1150 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192887 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: When dogs are on leash, they naturally act more

agressively toward each other because they can't negotiate in their natural way. This is the best part of my day because it's so beautiful there at the shore. I would be dismayed if this was taken from me. This ability figured into my decision to live in the Bay Area. I support many , pet related, businesses including pet supply stores, veteranarians, groomers...at one time... dog walkers....so...my pets and I contribute to local economies.

Concern ID:

29711

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters support off-leash areas because it affords greater mental and/or physical health for their dogs, provides for socialization, or better behavior (vs. on leash requirements).

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 931

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191404

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Providing for off-leash access makes our dogs and our families healthier, happier, and safer.

Corr. ID: 989

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191704

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In recent years I have been struck by how fewer and fewer areas in the Bay Area are being made available for off-leash dogs. It has been proven that dogs that receive proper exercise and socialization with other dogs are better behaved, happier, healthier and bring greater joy to the lives of the people that own and love them. Restricting more areas from being off-leash will directly infringe upon this. Dogs need vigorous exercise. Walking alongside an owner while tethered to a leash is not adequate exercise by any reasonable definition. Additionally, dogs need to interact with other dogs and other people to remain well-socialized. By removing more and more opportunities for dogs to exercise properly and be socially acclimated to other dogs and other people breeds a vicious cycle that results in dog "events" such as fights or bites. Ironically, a plan to remove off-leash areas due, in part, in an attempt to reduce dog events such as a fight or bite will only ensure more such events.

Corr. ID: 1317

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195060

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a dog trainer in the Bay Area and believe that off leash dog play and exercise is a huge part of a behaviorally well dog. Without off leash areas to roam and interact with other dogs and people, dogs will most likely develop many behavior concerns due to lack of contact, frustration from leash restraint and this may escalate to aggression. As a dog owner and someone that interacts with hundreds of dog owners every week, we need off leash areas in order to live harmoniously in this city.

Corr. ID: 1417

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195355

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Again, as a vet I've sutured up my fair share of dog fight wounds, and it's interesting to note that none of my cases have come from off-leash dog parks: they've all happened while on leash and on sidewalks, many times even in yards. Not to say that the risk of dog fights isn't higher in areas with higher dog density, just that the majority of owners who take the time to walk their dog off-leash in the areas in question are responsible and conscientious, and this leads to more happy, healthy, and mentally stable pets.

Corr. ID: 1674

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191073

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If our dog wasn't allowed off lead at Baker or Ocean beach, he would be depressed. I love my dog, and it would hurt me to see him on lead for 45 minutes around our house rather than out for 1:45 at a beach. It is our

responsibility as dog owners to protect our dogs, and by letting these new regulations occur, it will only worsen our dogs lives, and frustrate their owners.

Corr. ID: 1897

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200387

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As an owner of a certified Service Dog, I am particularly upset at the prospect of having her off-leash running activity curtailed or eliminated. For her to run unbridled is her only opportunity to be "off work," and is essential for her well-being. Obviously, this leads to my own well-being, as she takes care of me all day, every day. I must suggest you take into consideration the impact this management plan will have on the many of us who rely on the assistance of their service animals.

Concern ID:

29712

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters believe that restricting off-leash areas at GGNRA will cause overcrowding of other dog parks and a negative or unsafe experience for their dog(s).

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 549

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182018

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are very few areas in San Francisco where dogs can run off leash, and taking these few areas away will have a wide reaching negative impact. The already overcrowded, small, and poorly maintained "dog parks" will only worsen. Dogs will suffer - they will not get the level of exercise that they need to maintain a healthy lifestyle.

Corr. ID: 1114

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192354

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs require sufficient levels of physical exercise and socialization in their daily regimens that cannot reasonably be attained unless they are permitted to be off leash in outdoor environments that support positive interaction with other dogs and people. Dogs lacking in sufficient exercise and socialization skills are at greater risk of developing poor behavior and social skills that runs counter to the animal's and the public's interest.

Corr. ID: 1591

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190818

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -Plan is too restrictive in off leash areas it will result in too many dogs in too small a space- danger for the dogs + humans. Also possibly more communicable diseases amongst the dogs.

Concern ID:

29713

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters suggest that removing/restricting the off-leash areas as suggested in the DEIS will make it harder for the SPCA to perform their goal of "no kill" at animal shelters and/or more dogs will be given up at shelters or less dogs will be adopted.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 578

Organization: San Francisco Professional Dog Walkers Association

Comment ID: 182094

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: San Francisco has a "No Kill" goal that no potentially adoptable animal in a city shelter (SF Animal Care and Control, SF/SPCA, Pets Unlimited). Representatives of the SF/SPCA have said that the Preferred Alternative will make it harder for the SF/SPCA to perform their mission to reduce surrenders to city shelters and make San Francisco a truly No Kill city.

Corr. ID: 1337

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195122

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs that are not adequately exercised can develop

behavior problems such as barking, destroying property in the home, etc. Behavior problems are one of the primary reasons that people surrender dogs at shelters.

Corr. ID: 1855

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200313

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: High energy dogs need to exercise far more than many of these people are capable of doing on leash, especially our growing numbers of elderly and handicapped citizens. Without adequate exercise and socialization opportunities, some people will have to give up their animals and others will find their dogs less calm and harder to handle.

Dogs ARE our recreation. We want to continue the partnership with them that we have enjoyed for years. The quality of life of our dogs and our people will suffer greatly if off-leash play is banned. Do not pass that restriction. Follow your mandate for recreation. Keep our dogs and people healthy.

Corr. ID: 1915

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192593

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The trickle down effect of the GGRNAs plan would result in more dogs being dropped off at shelters, as dogs desperately need to learn social skills from each other and they need an outlet for their energy.

Corr. ID: 2147

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193443

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Marin County has one of the highest adoption rates - For this reason, the shelters are able to rescue many dogs from all over California + even Mexico that would otherwise be euthanised! One of the main reasons that enables this invaluable service to continue is the Bay Area's love + compassion for dogs (animals). Many people are motivated to adopt (save) shelter dogs fro the animal's benefit + quality of life AS WELL AS their own - i.e. outdoor activities, social networking, fresh air on beautiful Marin County trails!! Dog-walking has become an important facet of managing depression, personal isolation + lack of social resources available. Being restricted from having a dog in some areas entirely as well as off-leash enforcement will, undoubtedly, affect that social bond + freedom we feel we must maintain at all costs.

Corr. ID: 3185

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203822

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Animal rescue is part of San Francisco's spirit. Please continue this unique tradition of our city's by maintaining the meager 1% of open space for off-leash dog exercise that has allowed SF residents for many years to rescue and rehabilitate these amazingly adaptable and forgiving animals (that we, as humans, are responsible for domesticating)

San Francisco has always set the standard in this country on its fearlessness for taking a stand on social justice issues - one of which has always been its advocacy for animal welfare. SF's city animal shelters have far lower euthanasia rates than any other city country-wide and hundreds of privately run animal rescue groups. This is a standard that SF has set that we can be proud of, as a liberal and progressive city, and a model for other cities to follow. Much of this is due to people's access to 'multi-recreational' usage land that allows them to adopt dogs and properly exercise them, or have them properly exercised by dog walkers/trainers, which can often off-set a dog's previous life of abuse or neglect. Dogs are amazingly adaptable creatures.

What the Proposed Plan doesn't take into consideration is that many 'rescue dogs' need to slowly acclimate to socialization with other dogs, and Option A (current plan) allows this by making good use of the 1% of GGNRA land (that will be taken away in the Proposed Plan) to exercise and socialize these special dogs. This land

enables them to, with training and guidance by the hundreds of passionate dog professionals in the city, eventually and gradually become fantastic canine citizens of responsible SF residents who see potential in these neglected and forgotten animals.

The Proposed Plan, restricting a drastically reduced amount of land to off leash dog interaction, will compromise how dogs learn to live in a city. If there is no space to properly exercise dogs, these dogs will continue to exhibit behavior problems in the more densely populated areas available to them, pose risks and probable law suits, or simply not be adopted or be surrendered, and subsequently euthanized. We will become like every other city. This is a waste of perfectly fantastic dogs who basically just need a chance to learn the rules.

Corr. ID: 3208

Organization: Rocket Dog Rescue

Comment ID: 202513

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a passionate dog rescuer, I can tell you that the preferred alternatives in the Plan will make the Bay Area's homeless animal problem worse. Less people will be able to or likely to keep their companion animals if they are stripped of places in which they are able to properly exercise their animals. The Plan is akin to putting more burden on our shelters and sending more dogs to needlessly die.

Not to mention that, in years of walking Ocean Beach or Crissy Field every single day, sometimes with dogs and sometimes without dogs, I have yet to see any wildlife or sensitive plant habitats harmed or infringed upon by companion animal dogs. Dog owners that use this RECREATION area are inherently responsible and value all life.

Corr. ID: 3466

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203297

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please reconsider. These are two of the reasons there are so many dogs in the shelters. People need a place to take their dogs, especially living in the city, where many do not have access to a yard. Dogs need to run, or often they have behaviour issues, stemming from built up energy and boredom, and guardians need a place to take them.

This hurts everyone. The shelters will be even more overcrowded.

Those who adopt should be rewarded, not made to feel as though no one wants them to succeed.

This also affects the dog-walkers and they provide a much needed service to all of those who work long hours, and are unable to give their dogs the outings they need to be healthy.

Corr. ID: 4224

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208975

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog behaviorists, including Ian Dunbar, Trish King, Jean Donaldson, and Veronica Boutelle, have said the loss of off-leash exercise will cause an increase in problem dog behaviors, including bites. This resulting increase in problem behaviors will lead to an increase in surrenders at city shelters, which cannot handle the increase. This is another impact on surrounding communities that was not considered in the DEIS.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

29714

Requiring leashes is not an adequate form of exercise for dogs and that lack of off-leash space is cruel or inhumane to animals.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1259 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 194957 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dogs are better behaved, less anxious, and happiest when they get appropriate exercise. I know that without appropriate off-leash activity I will not be able to properly exercise my dog.
Corr. ID: 1351 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195199 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 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 can not run and play off leash. Exercise and socializing is critical to a dog's health and well-being.
Corr. ID: 1939 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192661 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The nature of a dog's need to run in free space has not been addressed. This constricting of areas amounts to cruelty to animals.
Corr. ID: 4453 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208497 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: People and dogs require fresh air and exercise for health; sufficient exercise simply cannot be provided to dogs that are unable to play since they are perpetually on-leash.

Concern ID: 29715
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Some dogs do better socially on-leash and these on-leash areas are better for their \(small, older, disabled\) dogs.](#)
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1551 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200012 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I'm commenting to encourage the GGNRA to both designate some on-leash areas and to enforce leash laws in these areas. A lot of the accessible hiking areas are either legally off-leash, or the bulk of people who go there flagrantly violate leash laws. A lot of dogs have special needs. Besides leash-reactive dogs who need some extra help and training, there are older dogs, disabled or physically challenged dogs, and even small breeds that can benefit from on-leash areas where approaches by other dogs are more controlled. I support off-leash areas for dogs that are comfortable in these spaces. But please, ensure that there is some space for dogs that do better when everyone is on leash, and make sure the laws are enforced so that everyone can have a good experience.

BB1100 - Baker Beach: Support Preferred Alternative

There were no comments on BB1100

BB1200 - Baker Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29260
CONCERN STATEMENT: [The preferred alternative for Baker Beach should allow off-leash dog walking. The Preferred Alternative restricts recreational access to visitors with dogs and as a result visitor use in this area would decrease dramatically by dog walkers and may increase at Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, and Fort Funston. In addition, dogs would not receive adequate exercise or socialization. Management of the land, which includes off-leash dog walking, should continue as it did prior to the NPS taking](#)

Representative Quote(s): [over the land.](#)
Corr. ID: 361 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181141 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Now, regarding the preferred alternative proposal for the Baker Beach unit, I find the proposed changes to be most unacceptable, and feel that they will basically end the use of this area for recreational use by dog owners and their companion animals.
Corr. ID: 1489 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191291 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am writing regarding the proposed resolution to ban all off-leash dog recreation at Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. I am thoroughly opposed to the proposed revisions to almost eliminate off-leash dog use.

This land was turned over to the GGNRA from the City of San Francisco with the intent that the recreational use would continue as it did under the management of the City of San Francisco. This included off-leash dog use.

Corr. ID: 1755 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191226 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am writing this letter in response to the discussion about no longer allowing dogs to run free at Baker Beach and on the Land's End trail. I am against this proposal.

My dog and I have gone to Baker Beach twice daily for the last five years. It has been a lifesaver not only for me because of the opportunity to exercise and socialize.

Corr. ID: 1774 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191567 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fort Baker Beach, I suggest that you reconsider "the 1979 pet policy" as the Preferred Alternative for Baker Beach. Eliminating a Regulated Off-Leash Dog Area at Baker Beach would have the effect of limiting Regulated Off-Leash Dog Areas in San Francisco to Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston. These three areas could then have increased density of people with dogs, and that could result in increased environmental degradation at these three areas due to overuse.

Concern ID: 29262

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The environmental benefit of the preferred alternative for Baker Beach is not explained or justified in the DEIS.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 941 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191460 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Baker Beach: What is the environmental benefit of the "Preferred" Alternative? Certainly there is not one that can be justified. The report calls for restrictions just to be restrictive with no justification. Same could be said for Muir Beach.
Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192061 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: b) Baker Beach:

The DEIS fails to provide support for the need to ban dogs from the northern section of the beach and fails to address the overcrowding and inherent conflicts from restricting dogs to the more populated areas of the beach. The DEIS fails to consider adequately the potential for increased dog walking at Baker Beach as a

result of the sharp reduction of space available for dog walking at the nearby Crissy Field and other GGNRA sites due to increased restrictions on dog walking mandated in DEIS. The DEIS should be changed to analyze the above effects, and the DEIS should be changed to continue to allow off leash dog play on the northern section of the beach while requiring on leash walking in the more heavily used areas down from the parking lots.

BB1300 - Baker Beach: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29263

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative A, the 1979 Pet Policy for the Preferred Alternative for Baker Beach. The existing off-leash dog walking areas should continue to be available to dogs and responsible owners.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 796 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186025 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a daily user of the Marin Headlands, Crissy Field, and Baker Beach. I would like to support alternative A in all these locations. Please keep the existing off leash areas open and available to dogs and their responsible owners

Corr. ID: 1243 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194924 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a frequent user of Baker Beach and would like to voice my support for Alternative A for Baker Beach (Map 12-A: Baker Beach). I believe Alternative A takes into account the needs and interests of the majority of recreational users of Baker Beach without having a negative impact on any of these users, or perhaps more importantly, the environment.

Concern ID: 29265

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters stated that if current conditions are unlikely, alternative E would be the best compromise since the southern portion of the beach would contain a ROLA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1554 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190742 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My preference for Baker Beach is to leave it as is, however, I realize that is highly unlikely. One proposal seems to have approximately 1/2 the beach designated off leash. I feel that is an acceptable compromise.

Corr. ID: 1774 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191571 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you cannot reconsider "the 1979 pet policy" as the Preferred Alternative for Baker Beach, then "Alternative E" for Baker Beach should be chosen.

BB1400 - Baker Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29267

CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLAs - Allow ROLAs on the southern portion of Baker Beach and on trails (specifically Coastal Trail) and allow on-leash dog walking within the picnic areas and the northern portion of Baker Beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 417 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181588 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Baker Beach (proposed Alternative D): The current proposal is for dogs leashed on most trails, banned from North Baker Beach.

Instead, dogs should be allowed off-leash on the trails and old battery nearest the parking lots, as they aren't sensitive habitat and not too high traffic. On leash in the picnic area and all other trails, as well as North Baker Beach (ie: not banned, but leashed). South Baker Beach, near the stream's run-off, should be designated as off-leash. This provides concern for habitat (leashed) without banning dogs, and encourages dog owners to walk their dogs on the southern portion, which would limit dogs in other areas (again, if the alternative is there, most dog walkers would prefer that area), as well as concern for picnic areas.

Corr. ID: 1949 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192689 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative 'A'+

The entire "Coastal Trail" needs to be a regulated off leash area..particularly since the trail is sparsely populated much of the day + night....

Concern ID:

29268

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Time of Day Restrictions - Allow ROLAs during "quiet periods" during the day at Baker Beach, specifically in the early morning and evenings on weeknights.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2024 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193239 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Why not have TIMED sessions for dogs to be off leash at Baker Beach - say 7-10 A.M. only? Then maybe no dogs. That would give dog owners a chance to exercise their dogs, and then the beach is free of dogs the entire rest of the day. China Beach, next door, allows no dogs at all, so birds can go there. Better screens could easily be installed to keep dogs out of the vegetation next to parking lots

Corr. ID: 2045 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193289 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Baker Beach

Morning & evening weekday only off-leash would not conflict the visitor experience (busiest tourist time)

Corr. ID: 2131 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193423 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Baker Beach is very quiet during periods of the day. Please put up good signage for off-leash times. Not weekends or holidays of course.

CB1000 - Comments Regarding the Compliance Based Management Strategy

Concern ID:

29651

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters oppose Compliance-Based Management Strategy because it is unfair/unclear and/or omits critical information that is not clearly defined in the DEIS. Commenters find the strategy unfair because it only allows changes to be more restrictive, does not include an opportunity for public comment if changes are made, and does not define what or how compliance will be determined.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 606 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182193 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have serious concerns about the GGNRA's off-leash proposal, particularly, the "poison pill" of the Compliance-based Management Strategy. A management plan should not come with a built-in nuclear option, which is what this is. This strategy is fundamentally unfair and unbalanced since it -

- Allows the off-leash status to be changed in only one direction (toward more restriction) with no possibility of increased access in the future.
- Circumvents the legal requirement that management changes that are either

significant or controversial must have a public process before they can be made.

- Omits critical information about how compliance will be determined, allowing room for misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

- Permits the GGNRA to change the status of off-leash areas to on-leash or no dogs without additional public comment if there is not 100% compliance with the new restrictions.

- Makes the change permanent.

While there should be, and are, enforced penalties for bad actors, the vast majority of people who do not act badly should not be penalized for the bad actions of a few. No number of responsible dog owners will stop what will become the inevitable removal of all off-leash access in the GGNRA if this strategy remains part of the plan. This component MUST be removed from the proposal.

Corr. ID: 772

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 185693

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The compliance-based management strategy is by definition too vague. How will the total number of dogs be determined without some kind of license or permit that also designates how often the dog uses the area? Most of the time I am exercising, I never see park personnel. If I walk my dog daily for an hour along the promenade and some out-of-town visitor has their dog off-leash in the same area, will that count as 1 violation out of 8 "dog uses", will it be 50% of the dogs on the path at that time, or will there be some accommodation for the length of time I have been in compliance and the de minimus time the visitor is not compliant? And for those who object to dogs being in the space they feel should be dog free (but has been designated ROLA), will there be an easing of restrictions if there is less than 75% compliance with the dog-adverse being in a ROLA area?

Corr. ID: 1326

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195075

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Compliance-Based Management Strategy must not be allowed! This poison pill that will allow the GGNRA to change the status of off-leash areas to on-leash or no dogs without additional public comment if there is not 100% compliance with the new restrictions will not work. This strategy is unfair because off-leash status can be changed in only one direction (toward more restriction). It circumvents the legal requirement that management changes that are either significant or controversial must have a public process before they can be made.

Corr. ID: 1339

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195134

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I find the adaptive management provision of the regulated off-leash areas (ROLAs) to be unacceptable. This provides the NPS with a mechanism to further erode dog access to on-leash only and even to prohibit dogs entirely without further consultation. The plan further states that under no circumstances will the reverse be true - once dogs are banned the park will never consider opening up access again.

Corr. ID: 1565

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190769

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: All areas: Compliance of 75% after 12 months this needs further definition. What is compliance? How do you measure it? Does it apply to tourists? Is that fair to Bay Area residents?

Corr. ID: 1694

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191101 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) The Compliance-Based Management Strategy is unfair and needs to go. It allows a relatively few bad dogs owners to determine how the rest of us get to use the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 2911 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202577 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS includes a "compliance-based management strategy" that says that, if there is not enough compliance with the restrictions imposed by the Preferred Alternative, the GGNRA will change the management of the various areas to the next more restrictive level - an offleash area will become on-leash only, an on-leash area will become no dogs at all. This change will be permanent, with no chance to go back to less restrictive levels at any time in the future. This section must be removed from any final Dog Management Plan.

a) This compliance-based management strategy is decidedly unfair, because it can only be changed in one direction - toward more restrictive levels of access for people with dogs.

b) There is no provision for public comment in the case of a change in status of an off-leash or on-leash area because of the compliance-based management strategy. The GGNRA has already lost two court cases (and one appeal) when it tried to make a significant and controversial policy change without going through a public process. The federal courts have routinely told the GGNRA that they have to hold public meetings and take public comments before making such changes. Clearly, a change in status of an off-leash area to leash-only would be both significant and very controversial, and therefore should require a period of public comment and public hearings before being implemented. The poison pill in the DEIS is an end run designed to allow the GGNRA to make such changes without having to go through a public process (they can claim the public process was the public comment on the

DEIS itself, not on the changes it allows at a future time).

c) How will compliance be monitored? Who will do the monitoring? The GGNRA has repeatedly relied on poorly trained volunteers with a deep-seated bias against dogs to monitor the interactions between dogs and snowy plovers. Why would we expect these compliance monitors to be any less biased? Will their claims of non-compliance be valid? Will the GGNRA resort to the use of surveillance cameras to monitor compliance? While noting that there is no mention of surveillance cameras in the DEIS, GGNRA staff have refused to say they would never be used.

Corr. ID: 3110 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201513 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The plan for dealing with non-compliance is a trap! 12 months with average 75% compliance is severe, but more importantly the plan that an area not in compliance would shift to the more restrictive alternative with no chance to ever get dog privileges back again later is unacceptable. (Do I have this right! Seems very bad.) I urge some plan where more restrictive enforcement is for a probational period, followed by return to the baseline alternative. It seems clear that the enforcement plan proposed can only move one way, and thus will gradually shift all areas to more restriction or exclusion of dogs, inevitably. That is totally nuts!?

Corr. ID: 4010 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206756 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If implemented well, adaptive management is an important and desirable approach to managing natural resources. However, the compliance-based management approach proposed for GGNRA is uni-directional and thus not adaptive. As described in DEIS pp. xiii-xiv, the GGNRA will only be adaptive in

terms of further restricting access. Any steps toward further restrictions will be permanent. This approach does not reflect adaptive management or any other good management principle that I'm aware of.

Corr. ID: 4017 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206853 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am in favor of any plan which:

4. Contains no poison pill which would permit the GGNRA to outlaw dog walking due to noncompliance. It is patently unfair to have a plan which allows the rights of law abiding dog walkers to be dependent on the compliance of other people.

Corr. ID: 4089 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208381 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Draft Plan/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. However, the detailed description of this critical element has not been conveyed and is not included in the document (as noted on page 64).

Corr. ID: 4452 **Organization:** San Francisco SPCA

Comment ID: 208467 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: We are concerned with the lack of detail on how the new rules will be monitored, how compliance will be tallied and the one-way direction further restricts our access to the GGNRA if compliance is not at 75% or greater.

Concern ID:

29652

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters have stated they are in support of Compliance-Based Management Strategy as they have seen multiple dog walkers in non-compliance with current regulations. Citations should be issued to non-compliant dog walkers.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 585 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182110 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully support the concept of a compliance-based management strategy, wherein lack of compliance means a permanent change to a more restrictive management classification. Again, if I thought this was enforceable, I would support it. The enforcement records indicate that most non-compliance with dog-owners resulted in a warning rather than a citation. Warnings don't produce the same results that citations do, so I would hope that any enforcement strategy would allow a window of adjustment wherein warnings are issued (maybe a year), but then go to an all-citation based policy

Corr. ID: 2701 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195550 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In any event, I would strongly urge you to implement the compliance program you propose. The advocates for off-leash repeatedly make statements that suggest only a tiny minority of owners don't comply with relevant rules, but my experience at parks and other locations where dogs are prohibited or are required to be on-leash is that a large number of owners do not obey the rules. I think the advocates should encourage the responsible owners to self-police the less responsible, and this is a good way to do it.

Corr. ID: 4070 **Organization:** Mar Vista Stables

Comment ID: 207696 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 12)Compliance Based Management Strategy (pg. xiii last paragraph)-Need to address noncompliance in ROLAs (e.g. not picking up waste, more commercial dogs than permitted per handler, etc.).

Concern ID: 29653
CONCERN STATEMENT: Compliance-Based Management is opposed because there would be no public process, including no public comment period and/or no public hearing.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 740 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182693 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: This is particularly concerning since the Compliance-based Management Strategy component of the proposal allows the GGNRA to change the status of off-leash areas to on-leash or no dogs without additional public comment if there is not 100% compliance with the new restrictions. The fact that the GGNRA can unilaterally circumvent the legal requirement to have a public hearing for any future changes is seriously concerning - it is not the way we do things in America!
Corr. ID: 1828 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191943 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I also strongly object to the "Compliance-Based Management Strategy". I feel it is a self serving attempt to circumvent the legal requirement of a public process when management changes that are significant or highly controversial are made. We are supposed to be a government by the people and the people are objecting to the preferred alternative so this is a way to ignore the citizens of this community
Corr. ID: 2230 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200849 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I also oppose the GGNRA's proposed Compliance-Based Management Strategy which will change the status of off-leash areas to on-leash or no dogs without a chance for me to comment. This is unprecedented and just un-American.
Corr. ID: 2274 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 201063 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Furthermore, as an environmentalist, I believe there should be (and are) penalties for bad actors and these should be enforced. But the vast majority of people who do not act badly should not be penalized for the bad actions of a few. This strategy is unfair because off-leash status can be changed in only one direction (toward more restriction). It circumvents the legal requirement that management changes that are either significant or controversial must have a public process before they can be made. Critical information about how compliance will be determined - by volunteers biased against dogs? by surveillance cameras? - is not included in the DEIS.
Corr. ID: 3737 **Organization:** SF Dog Owners Group
Comment ID: 204244 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Compliance-based Management Strategy cannot be part of any plan. It changes status of areas (off-leash becomes on-leash; on-leash becomes no dog) automatically and permanently if GGNRA claims not enough compliance with new restrictions. No evidence of impacts from non-compliance are necessary, only the fact that there is non-compliance. This will potentially end off-leash access without giving people a chance to comment on the change.

Concern ID: 29654
CONCERN STATEMENT: The Compliance-Based Management Strategy should be higher than 75 % compliance since this would still allow disturbance within the park sites.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 944 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191499 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 4. The goal of achieving 75% compliance with the leash and voice control requirements is far too low. The Park Service should not be creating a system that expects and tolerates failure by 25% of the dog walkers. Golden Gate Audubon recommends a goal of 95% compliance with leash and voice control requirements.

Corr. ID: 1522 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190688 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 4) Compliance for areas where dogs are allowed should be 95%. At 75% compliance, a significant amount of damage still can be done. Monitoring must be given priority, as well as clear signage.

Corr. ID: 1546 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190736 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 4) Compliance should be 95%. The 75% allows too much disturbance. Dog walkers (owners) on their web site admit 75% at some point disregard the on-leash signage.

Corr. ID: 2675 **Organization:** NPCS

Comment ID: 195493 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Endangered species wildlife habitat deserve a higher level of protection from human disturbance; the compliance rate should be 95%, not 75% as outlined.

Limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats.

Corr. ID: 3759 **Organization:** Wild Equity Institute

Comment ID: 204633 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Park Service admits that it's preferred alternative, a compliance management program, will only strive for 75% compliance-a far lower standard than the standard the Park Service apparently applied to physical barriers when they were rejected from the alternative analysis. This is a blatant failure to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and the Administrative Procedure Act.

Corr. ID: 4683 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210180 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 75% compliance: The idea of 75% compliance is unrealistic and unacceptable. With current closures to off leash dogs on most of Ocean Beach. we only have less than 30% compliance with leash laws during the period of mid July 2010 and mid May 2011. Success cannot be measured at a level of poor compliance. We believe the Park Service should establish a success goal of 85% for the first year or the area should be closed to dogs all together. The rate for the following years should be at the 95% level for all beaches and other sensitive habitat areas. Compliance might be supplemented by education and warnings, but that has not worked in the past. It is a simple fact that compliance must be enforced with citations on a daily basis until the desired compliance rate is achieved.

Concern ID:

29655

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose or questions Compliance-Based Management and how the park will monitor or demonstrate the level of compliance or how the park will measure non-compliance [without baseline conditions]. It is recommended that the park monitor to determine baseline conditions and then measure impacts to resources rather than monitor for compliance. A detailed monitoring plan with clear, enforceable standards and metrics should be written.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1210 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194853 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Compliance-Based Management Strategy: As described in the draft, it is unclear how GGNRA staff would be able to demonstrate with valid data that "compliance has fallen below 75 percent (measured as the percentage of total dogs/dog walkers observed during the previous 12 months not in compliance with the regulations. . .). This strategy has the potential to create a lot of law suits and acrimony between GGNRA staff and dog walkers.

Corr. ID: 3733 **Organization:** SF DOG, Save McLaren Park

Comment ID: 204574 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed "compliance-based" 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.

Corr. ID: 3745 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204607 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The compliance based management system has got to be removed. It will not be implemented in a fair way. There is no way to measure compliance as a number reliably, and it will be done subjectively, by a 3rd party who will have no interest in being accurate anyway. There will be some level of non-compliance, and that level will be called excessive, and off leash will become leash, and leash will become no dog.

Corr. ID: 4223 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208949 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed "compliance-based" approach should be modified to create a baseline of current conditions, 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.

Corr. ID: 4533 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209689 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no indication of how compliance would be measured and by what standards or who would measure it, and the consequences of non-compliance (for which there is not necessarily any or significant negative impact on natural resources) are rigid and biased. Change the Plan/DEIS to instead provide for management of areas driven by an adaptive management policy that assesses the impacts of non-compliance and provides regulation based on the impacts, with the ability to reinstate dog walking policies as previously enjoyed in areas where they may be restricted because of negative impacts if those impacts can be remedied. The current ROLA regulations in the Plan should be thoroughly revised to add clarity and allow for such flexibility and fairness to responsible citizens with dogs.

Corr. ID: 4685 **Organization:** Marin Conservation League

Comment ID: 209984 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The proposed Compliance-Based Management Strategy will be based primarily on monitoring and recording the behavior of users by observation, but the Plan does not include a detailed monitoring plan. The Draft Plan establishes 75% as an acceptable level of compliance. However, the management response (i.e., changing ROLAs to on-leash areas, and -on-leash- to "no dogs") would not be implemented unless the compliance rate dropped below 75%. Given the size of GGNRA, the limited number of personnel, and this inexact measure of compliance, it will be difficult to develop an adequate monitoring plan.

Implementing the monitoring plan in a way that produces reliable results and is legally defensible will be even more difficult. Particularly in ROLAs, the assessment of compliant -voice control" will require nuanced measures. The Plan and EIS must assure the public that compliance will be consistently monitored by establishing defensible, understandable, easily measured, and enforceable standards and metrics.

CC2000 - Consultation and Coordination: Reg-Neg process

Concern ID: 29834

CONCERN STATEMENT: The plan should include more than one fully enclosed ROLA since this was one of the items that resulted in consensus of the multi-year Negotiated Rulemaking Process. In the absence of physical barriers around an off-leash area dogs may be lost, injured, or killed.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29686 (AL1000), Comment 201290.

Concern ID: 29840

CONCERN STATEMENT: The Reg Neg committee should have included representatives from Marin County. More than three areas in Marin County should have been discussed by the Reg Neg committee.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4005 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 206271 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: One general point that I find particularly disturbing is the lack of participation allowed to Marin County in creating the Reg Neg committee itself. To exclude such an extensive natural area from even being at the table as a stakeholder to me seems patently absurd. Agreement or disagreement with concepts or proposals is one thing; exclusion from participation in the discussion about them is quite another.

Concern ID: 29841

CONCERN STATEMENT: Local citizens (including dog owners) should have been able to participate in regulation drafting; however, the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee was a good effort to include the local public in designing regulation.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29833 (AD1100), Comment 206813.

Concern ID: 29845

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters were disappointed that in almost two years of negotiating very little was accomplished by the Reg Neg committee. Other commenters commended the NPS for the Reg Neg process given the controversial nature of this project.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29706 (LU2000), Comment 208875.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4639 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208788 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I served on the committee that was supposedly charged with "negotiated rulemaking". I agreed that there might have to be compromises, as did the representatives of all the other dog friendly groups. Apparently, that requirement (compromises) was not a requirement for many of the other folks that served on this committee. I went to each and every area that the GGNRA manages. I walked/hiked. I photographed each area. I assumed we'd be talking about specific

areas and how they were being used currently and how to manage them better. I thought we might be able to discuss access (Milagra Ridge, for example, is basically a neighborhood park because the parking is extremely limited & the access without an automobile is difficult). We suggested discussing timed use (successful in a number of areas). We were told that timed use was too difficult for people to understand! We suggested a tag system, similar to one being used by Boulder Open Space in Colorado (with people actually going to Boulder to investigate the use). That, too, was dismissed. So, in two years almost nothing was accomplished. I was disappointed in the facilitators and disgusted that a few people made sure that nothing was ever really discussed. And yet the Park Service managed to come up with a huge plan that is NOT a result of any negotiated rulemaking.

Concern ID:

31540

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The negotiated rulemaking process did not take into account all important factors and circumstances. Negotiated rulemaking was undertaken despite objections to the options presented for discussion, and does not satisfy rulemaking requirements.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4697

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227448

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: (A) The Crissy Field development plan was based on a finding of no significant impact based on an assumption that the additional off leash areas then existing in the dog management plan were to be continued. If the assumption on which the Crissy Field development FONSI relied is arbitrarily removed, or retroactively determined to be false as implied by the DEIS, it is arbitrary and capricious to proceed inconsistently overruling the prior finding without analysis.

(B) After the issuance of the rulemaking on the Fort Funston closure, recreational users requested reconsideration of the ruling. Some of the requests for reconsideration received no response, and therefore are still pending. Director Mainella's eventual response to one of the requests for reconsideration included a promise that the scope of the dog walking at the closed areas would be part of the subject matter considered in the later planned consideration of overall dog walking management in the GGNRA. Director Mainella was correct in concluding that the traditional dog walking use of those areas is indeed a proper subject of consideration concerning the overall dog walking management plan. Recreational users had a right to rely on the representations of the Director. It is arbitrary and capricious to preclude consideration of those areas in the current DEIS.

(C) It is arbitrary and capricious to fail to consider the social and environmental impact of the creeping closures of dog walking areas initially allowed in the 1979 Pet Policy. Closures of those areas have significant impact on the important impact factor of the concentration of the recreational use in limited areas. Offsetting mitigation replacement areas should be considered as part of any impact analysis, as should the impact of the closures.

The preferred alternative plan adopts an improper hostile compliance based management scheme calling for further limitation if there is not 75% compliance with the change. In essence, the plan replaces the requirement of future rulemaking over any significant change with a plan allowing the GGNRA to make future changes administratively. That switched procedure violates the rulemaking requirement.

Corr. ID: 4697

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227446

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Negotiated rulemaking protocols generally call for considering all potential solutions and allowing the public process to paint on a fresh canvas. Although the NPS received objections to the negotiated rulemaking process proceeding based on constrained options, the NPS went forward with the drastically curtailed approach precluding full consideration of the relevant factors. Reliance of such an approach in the face of notice of the clear insufficiency of the approach is arbitrary and capricious and does not satisfy the 36 CFR 1.5 rulemaking requirements. The same procedural impropriety is employed in the current management plan alternatives in the DEIS.

CF1100 - Crissy Field: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29441

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it allows a no-dog area at the East Beach of Crissy Field so visitors can have a park beach experience without dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180044 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a frequent user of the Crissy Field East Beach area, near the north end of the main Crissy parking lot by the concrete bathroom building and the windsock. I am fully in agreement with the Plan's recommendation that this area be made a no-dog area. Please register another SF native and 40-year resident in support of this plan.

Corr. ID: 85 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181890 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field

The preferred alternative is a good balance. When the east beach is busy there can be far too many dogs and people competing for space.

Corr. ID: 170 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182282 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the plan's proposal to require dogs to be on-leash in the East Beach area of Crissy Field.

Corr. ID: 653 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181488 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Hello, I am in favor of the preferred alternative in the proposed dog management plan especially were it prohibits dogs on or off-leash at East Beach at Crissy Field.

The problem is out of control with Dogs chasing wildlife, poop everywhere, digging wholes, peeing on personal property, biting and knocking people over.

Also I am disappointed with that lack of enforcement of the current rules; specifically keeping Dogs out of the out door shower and bathroom at Crissy field.

Concern ID: 29442

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it requires on-leash dog walking on the promenade at Crissy Field.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1485 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191266 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing in support of the proposed Dog Plan for the Fort Mason/Crissy Field area.

As a dog owner who frequently walks our dog on Crissy field, I believe that

requiring leashes for dogs walking on the Promenade is a plan that protects both dogs and other visitors. Also, I believe that allowing dogs off lead on the center beach, provides a necessary, adequate and beautiful area for dogs to run free. I also agree that at least a portion of the eastern beach closest to the parking lot should not allow dogs off lead. This particularly true when in the summer months many families with small children use that beach.

Corr. ID: 4354

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209529

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: CRISSY FIELD, east, west, and central

The most uncaring, self-centered dog owners I have encountered walk on the Golden Gate Promenade. Many of them do not keep their dogs under voice control so that others can walk without being bothered. My grandson froze against my leg several times in the course of the three Tuesday mornings we were there, (I have not tried the area on a weekend or holiday.) My instinctive reaction is to suggest that the Promenade is no place for unleashed dogs because it is too narrow and because of the attitude of the dog owners. Also, I think the Promenade with its splendid views of the Golden Gate is an area that should welcome visitors from outside San Francisco, and I don't think it does at this time.

The dogs and their owners seem to do better along the beach, probably because the dogs have room to roam and seem to be more interested in the other dogs they meet and the balls or sticks their owners are throwing. However, the owners also seem to be more aware and respectful of other people on the beach that their dogs move to encounter and to call them off.

My grandson may also feel he has more room to avoid them.

There are certain areas along the beach favored by the commercial dog walkers' two or three may congregate together. There may be 12 - 18 dogs at a time in one place. In general, these dog walkers seem to keep relatively good control over their dogs. Not having a dog with me, I don't really know how these small packs of dogs relate to single animals coming down the beach but I have not seen any incidents.

Therefore, I support maximum leash restrictions on the Promenade, while favoring a broad area for off-leash on the beach, consonant with wildlife protection. I haven't been able to observe the interactions of dogs with people on the former airfield.

Having written the above, I checked the Plan maps and find I support the Preferred Alternative.

An additional note: A friend told me that she and her husband unwittingly wandered into the wildlife protection area on the beach side because the signage was not clear enough on that side so that they didn't realize they had entered it. If this has not been mentioned before, I hope someone will check this out at both high and low tide to make sure the signage is very observable along the beach.

Concern ID:

29443

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support the beach ROLA or Airfield ROLA proposed at Crissy Field because it is proposed in a preferred location.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1917

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192599

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field - The beach ROLA in the Preferred alternative is the safest place for dogs to swim (compared to the beaches on the ocean).

Corr. ID: 3937

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205878 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I support the use of the Airfield at Crissy Field as a ROLA, as that is an area where dogs will not interfere with wildlife or other users.

Concern ID: 29444

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it does not allow dogs in the Crissy Wildlife Protection Area or the Tidal Marsh (wetland area).

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1159 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 193461 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I strongly recommend rules requiring that dogs be on leash or banned completely from Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area. Dogs frequently jump on strangers trying to enjoy that area, they run wild on the beaches, they climb through or jump over the fences and dig up the new plantings, and they chase birds. Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area is at risk for being over-taken by dogs like has happened at Fort Funston. The most important parts that need to be protected are the walking paths and the beaches. These areas are used heavily and are not conducive to dogs off leash. Protecting Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area from dogs is critical to the success of GGNRA. Letting dogs run off leash harms the ability of users to enjoy GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates

Comment ID: 209122 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: CRISSY FIELD WILDLIFE PROTECTION AREA. Dogs should be excluded from the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area because the presence of dogs is not compatible with protection of wildlife. As stated above, dogs disrupt wildlife and reduce wildlife use of areas.

Corr. ID: 4541 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 209716 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dogs are not appropriate for the Crissy field wetland area.

Corr. ID: 4584 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 210027 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Crissy Central Beach ' The Central Beach ROLA should be fenced and gated. Fences at the west and east ends should extend to the water at extreme low tide. Adequate buffer zones (-300ft) should be included beyond the west and east boundary fences to protect the WPA and the lagoon outlet from the influences of excessive dog play activity. Access points from the promenade should be gated. Signs should be posted clearly identifying the area as an off-leash dog play area and stating the voice and sight control rules.

Crissy East Beach ' Fencing should be installed to protect the lagoon outlet zone. Outlet areas from bodies of water into bays or oceans are of high habitat value. The outlet zone should be included as part of the protected lagoon area and similarly fenced.

Concern ID: 29445

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it has less off-leash dog areas for visitors who want a no-dog experience at Crissy Field and/or provides a balance of on-leash, off-leash, and no dog areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2197 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 200695 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I wanted to take a moment to voice my support for the recommended changes to the current dog walking rules at Crissy field. I love Crissy field, but I don't like the dog owners and their dogs for turning into one big off leash extravaganza. Instead of smelling like ocean air, the place smells of dog

urine. My son has been scared multiple times by a wandering off-leash dog, with a surprised owner saying he wont bite, he's friendly. Not every body wants to know or be bothered by their animal. if dogs can come to Crissy field without rules, why cant horse owners do the same. Make rules and enforce them without hesitation.

Corr. ID: 2293

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201174

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to voice my support for dog management at Chrissy field. I write a a dog-owner and lover; however, Golden Gate National Recreation area is adversely impacted by large numbers of dog running off-leash. Visitors are often accosted by dogs. I have also witness many incidents of dogs chasing other wildlife and plants.

Corr. ID: 4526

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209611

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I walk Crissy Field most days of the week from the Golden Gate Bridge to the St. Francis Yacht Club and back. I am writing in support of your organization's plan to require leashed dogs on all sidewalks and paved roads in the GGNRA and limited, regulated off-leash areas as indicated on your Map 10, Preferred Alternative: Crissy Field. This plan appears to offer balanced solutions for dog owners, dog-less walkers and out-of-town visitors. I would love to take that walk without concern for free-running dogs while enjoying the protected plantings, wildlife and the amazing scenery.

CF1200 - Crissy Field: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID:

29448

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters do not support reducing the off-leash areas at Crissy Field as part of the Preferred Alternative because limiting these areas would reduce their enjoyment of this site that is an important recreation area, and would result in the overcrowding of dogs in proposed off-leash areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 163

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182274

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am opposed to the proposal of limiting off leash dogs on many historically dog friendly recreational walks, particularly on Crissy Field's East Beach.

Corr. ID: 221

Organization: Personal Use

Comment ID: 180693

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly oppose creating any restricted areas for dogs at either Chrissy Field or Fort Funston. As a dog owner, those areas are vital (and rare) spaces where my dog is free to interact with the environment. A contained space is simply not the same for a dog, or a dog owner. It would also significantly hinder my use and enjoyment of the space. In fact, although I am a frequent visitor to both parks now, I would be unlikely to go at all if the only option was a penned in space.

Corr. ID: 233

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180739

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a responsible dog owner, I feel that that dog management plan draft is far too limiting for the large number of us responsible dog owners. Looking at the map with the proposed dog areas at Crissy Field, half the main areas where dogs have the most fun will be off limits. While I do feel off leashdogs must be under strict control by their owners, cutting the few areas where dogs can RUN, is a terrible direction for the GGNRA to take.

Corr. ID: 272

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180880

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I go to Ft. Funston and Crissy Field because of the wide open spaces and freedoms it affords allowing dogs to be dogs. My dog is never sick after playing at Ft. Funston or Crissy Field. My family has accepted the contained dog play areas in our neighborhood but please don't eliminate the privilege of largely unrestricted off leash play areas at Ft Funston or Crissy Field.

Corr. ID: 344

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181117

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Fields and Fort Funston must be kept for the enjoyment of off-leash dogs, their owners, and everyone else! With the dwindling space left for dogs to run free (as it is in their nature to do),we can't lose these beloved spot. Limiting their use is awful.

Corr. ID: 396

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181188

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Basically, it seems entirely unnecessary to me to restrict dog use at Chrissy Field. There is enough room for everybody. I am a bird lover as well as a dog lover and an environmentalist. I love Chrissy Field and I hope that it can continue to be the recreation area I love so much, inclusive of dogs and their happy owners.

Corr. ID: 1202

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194829

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We pay our share of tax for public schools, please let us continue to have the opportunity to play with our 'kids' off-leash. I'm looking at the proposed map of Chrissy Field--hundreds of dogs and their owners enjoy this beach every day. If this regulation is approved and we are only allowed a little strip of beach, it will be grossly congested and not enjoyable for anyone.

Concern ID:

29454

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Site Accessibility - Commenters do not support reducing the off-leash areas at Crissy Field as part of the Preferred Alternative because accessibility of the ROLA is an issue, including parking areas for disabled (or mobility impaired) persons or for families since leashes are required at parking areas (at East Beach) or the walk to the beach ROLA from the parking area would be longer than the current walk to the beach that allows dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 988

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191701

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Have you been to Crissy Field? Many people who bring their dogs to the beach use the parking lot west of the tidal marsh. All of your plans make that part of the air field "leash required" so, there is no place that you can go from the parking lot to the beach that is all off leash. Even if they use the larger parking lots to the east, there is no off leash areas near the beach so we all have to deal with leashes no matter what with your plans.

Corr. ID: 1627

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190935

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preferred alternative for Crissy Field fails to consider the shortage of parking near + adjacent to the field where dogs would be permitted off leash. The lack of parking would prevent many people, especially the disabled and seniors (like me) who cannot walk far, from exercising our dogs (e.g., throwing balls with Chuck-its). Our dogs badly need their exercise and cannot get needed exercise by extremely limited on-leash walking, because we cannot walk very far. We must have convenient off-leash areas. Please change the Preferred Alternative so we can exercise our dogs on the Crissy Field East Beach, where we can park our automobiles and not have to walk far.

Corr. ID: 2219

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200789 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposal suggests that Crissy Field separate the family area and dog area by banning dogs from the beach located in front of the parking lot. When you visit Crissy Field today, the beach front at the parking lot is full of families and their dogs. Banning dogs from the area will also bann families from the area. This is unfair to our families who will be pushed away from the bathrooms and be forced to lugg our family picnic supplies and strollers to a greater distance away from the parking lot. Banning dogs from the fore-beach area takes away from the purpose of the park as a city recreational space. This is unproductive and unfair

Corr. ID: 2815 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201121 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Due to a serious accident I can no longer skate or engage in strenuous activities and therefore the ambiance of Crissy Field has become even more important to our family Our sons often bring our grandchildren to enjoy the space'

As the proposed areas of elimination at Crissy field appear it would be almost impossible for a handicapped person with family and dog to get onto the beach. This has not been thought through.

There are thousands of people who would be asked to use this cramped area!

We support Alternative A, but suggesting leashing be required in the parking area which would be advantageous for visitors, other users, safety of children and dogs as well.

Corr. ID: 3707 **Organization:** PHRA, NAPP (speaking on behalf of myself in this case)

Comment ID: 202246 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The comments that follow refer only to the Crissy Field area, because I am most familiar with it.

The two areas selected for off-leash dog walking in the Preferred Plan discriminate against people with disabilities:

Central Beach is, of course, sand, and that is a very difficult surface for people who have walking or pulmonary problems. Walking on sand takes a lot more energy than walking on a firm surface. For people in wheel chairs, it probably precludes them for using it.

Similarly, the grassy areas of the former landing strip are lumpy and difficult to walk on.

At both areas, there is insufficient access to adequate parking close by to accommodate handicapped dog owners who have come to Crissy Field to exercise their dogs.

I have pulmonary problems and enjoy off-leash dog walking on the Promenade. On the Promenade, bicyclists are a problem because most of them ignore the posted 5 MPH speed limit. The riders with dogs are the most egregious abusers of disposing of their dogs' feces because they ride far ahead of their sniffing, social pets.

I could be somewhat satisfied with access limited to Central Beach + the southern half of the former airstrip -- IN ADDITION TO THE PROMENADE AND BEACH ACCESS BEGINNING ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE BRIDGE TO THE WESTERN END OF CENTRAL BEACH. This suggestion does not address the added burden to City open space by limiting off-leash walking as much as you have suggested.

I would also like to point our that on rainy and/or winter days, dog walkers are the main users of Crissy Field.

Corr. ID: 3756

Organization: Can't delete check in "member," an error. Sorry

Comment ID: 204615

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preferred proposal for Crissy Field is unworkable. The off leash area is ill-defined with little parking. it seems designed to create infractions and makes no rational sense as it will only concentrate a greater number of dogs (particularly from adjoining areas where they are even more restricted) on a smaller space virtually guaranteeing problems. Further, from the maps it appears that the dog area will be the same area as is used by the increasing number of big events from which dogs are necessarily excluded. THIS is short sighted and unfair.

Corr. ID: 4615

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206362

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have reviewed the maps you have presented and am very concerned that your proposed alternative where dogs are restricted to a very small area of Crissy Field is unfair to people who own dogs and unfair to those of us who cannot walk to those areas where you are telling the dogs to go. These areas are a significant distance from the parking lot and I would not be able to participate with my family in playing with and watching the dogs.. This would take away my enjoyment of Crissy Field. I have also noticed that when I am with a friend with a dog or we have with us a dog that a friend has let us take out people are much friendlier to me and do not notice my disability but talk to me about the dog. I makes me feel like I am part of the community. I think that people with dogs are friendlier and nicer in general.

Concern ID:

29457

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters do not support the Preferred Alternative because it does not allow dogs on East Beach, or because dogs are not allowed in the Tidal Inlet, or because it limits the off-leash dog area at the Crissy Field Airfield.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 773

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 185695

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field. Although I do appreciate the potential need to separate dogs from some areas, given the usage in the area during the week, I don't believe that you need to adopt an absolute no-dog zone for the East Beach area.

Corr. ID: 1661

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191061

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Chrissy Field- The East beach is a favorite for families to bring their dog - don't penalize them

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192053

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In banning dogs from the East Beach, DEIS fails to take into account the negative effects and other factors outlined below. The DEIS should address these factors:

- Many families that have children also have a dog and would want access to nearby facilities at East Beach.
- Elderly or more handicapped individuals that want to take their dog to the beach would have access through East Beach.
- East beach sees a lot of activity from windsurfers/kite surfers who drag equipment across beach, making it less suitable for families with small children and beach picnics.
- In practice, fog, rain, and wind make beaches in San Francisco inhospitable for

family beach play and picnics for much of the year. Among major U.S. cities San Francisco has the coldest daily temperatures (mean, minimum and maximum) in June, July and August. As a result, dogs would be banned from East Beach for no real purpose.

- Visitors seeking a dog free beach experience with nearby facilities will have access to the beach in the WPA near the Warming Hut.

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192058

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS restricts off leash dog play to the center portion of the Airfield and requires leashes on the eastern portion of the Airfield.

Comment: The DEIS provides no scientific or other support for restricting off leash dog play on the eastern portion of the grassy Airfield. The DEIS fails to take into account the following factors that support maintaining the entire Airfield as a off leash dog play area.

The DEIS should address these factors and should be changed to permit off leash dog walking on the entire Airfield.

- The Airfield is presently used primarily by dog walkers for on and off leash play and is not suitable for picnics and most other activities because it is often wet (poor drainage) and a distance from bathrooms, etc. It is also characterized by uneven ground with many gopher/vole holes and dirt mounds, patchy uneven grass reflecting impact of many events on natural grass planted at time of restoration of Airfield.

- During the spring, summer and fall months, many events are held on the central portion of the grassy field, making this area unavailable for off leash play. Under the Plan during these events, dogs would have no off leash play area on the entire northern side of the City except the central beach at Crissy Field.

- With a major reduction in other off leash play areas, keeping the entire field available makes sense.

Corr. ID: 2204

Organization: Crissy Field

Comment ID: 200715

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am saddened by the changes proposed for Crissy Field. I can live with most of them but the worst one is no dogs in the INLET between CENTRAL BEACH and EAST BEACH.

Corr. ID: 2235

Organization: Crissy field dog group

Comment ID: 200866

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Re: Map 10-Crissy Field. It is my fervent wish to support Alternative A - that map which continues to allow maximum access to beachfront off-leash activity, especially continued use of East Beach.

Corr. ID: 3633

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204194

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my opposition to the preferred alternative in the DEIS. I have been a resident of the Marina for 21 years and daily user of Crissy Field and an weekly user of Baker Beach and Fort Mason. For the community of local dog owners, walking at Crissy is an important part of our daily lives and a way to stay in touch with friends and neighbors. The preferred alternatives for all these areas seem unnecessarily restrictive, excluding large areas (such are the airfield) which are rarely utilized by other park users unless there is a weekend event. Although I can understand restrictions on heavily trafficked areas such as the promenade, the proposed restrictions seem excessive. Also concerning is the "poison pill" provision where the NPS reserves the right to rescind all 'off leash' dog walking based on a single infraction. This is absurd! Are you also similarly proposing to ban all cyclists in the GGNRA if one cyclist exceeds the speed limit or ban all cars if one driver rolls through a stop sign? I doubt it. An anti-

dog bias is clearly evident throughout the document. This process is not about finding a compromise, it is about imposing a solution that brings the GGRNA rules in line with existing NP properties, not withstanding the existing mandate to preserve recreational uses that is the foundation of the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3652

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204124

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I drive to the city on a regular basis to walk with my dog at East Chrissy Field beach. Please don't take this away or the other dog friendly venues. There are countless numbers of venues that are not dog friendly that families and individuals who do not wish to share their space with dogs having fun to frequent. These open spaces are far safer than small overcrowded "dog parks" that are can be measured in square feet. Furthermore, for destination dog friendly venues, most people also spend money in that community. So the potential for lost revenue to local business is real.

Corr. ID: 4412

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207001

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Chrissy Field

AIRFIELD: It is both impractical and illogical to limit the proposed ROLA to the center section of the airfield.

- 1) The east section of the airfield lies between two proposed ROLA's which will cause confusion and require the park service to put up signs or fence off the area.
- 2) The walkways along and through the east section of the airfield provide access to the Central Beach proposed ROLA
- 3) It is impractical and illogical not to have a contiguous ROLA
- 4) The east section of the airfield is not a high traffic area for either people, dogs or wildlife (unless you count gophers)
- 5) Corralling all dogs into one section of the airfield will overtax that section of land
- 6) If the concern is simply to craft a compromise between those who wish to allow dog access to the airfield, and those who don't, then time restrictions, rather than area restrictions, would be a more sensible way to do so. (The area would only need to be patrolled for a portion of the day, which would, of course, result in some cost savings to the government.)

Concern ID:

29458

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters do not support the Preferred Alternative because they support less off-leash or on-leash areas at Crissy Field or think dogs should be banned entirely to allow the public to enjoy the site or to protect wildlife at the site.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1556

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190746

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field:

No dogs at waters edge of Crissy Field. "Dogs allowed" in any area means "off leash" to owners.

Preferred 10B if must allow. Forget Map 10, 10A, 10C, 10D, and 10E

Picnic areas are at 2 far ends of C.F. + are extremely crowded. Enhance that experience by increasing indiv. tables and group picnic areas on 2/3 of Crissy Air Field + reduce that area for dogs by that 2/3. This is an entirely too large area for off leashed dogs + will mean they will cross Promenade + dominate the coastal area on both sides of Pier with uncontrolled dogs.

Corr. ID: 2862

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202695

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not allow dogs on Crissy Field or the East Beach

there

Corr. ID: 3404

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203230

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge the GGNRA to adopt the policies for each site that would be most protective of natural resources and wildlife, especially endangered or threatened species. I believe the top concern for national parks should be preservation of the environment and of wildlife.

I also am concerned about the many times I have been approached, touched, or jumped on, whether playfully or aggressively, by off-leash dogs in some areas, especially Crissy Field. Off-leash dogs represent some amount of injury that is just waiting to happen. I would prefer that leashes be required in all of Crissy Field, but if off-leash areas are permitted, I believe they should be fenced. It is plain that neither dogs nor many of their owners or walkers will voluntarily obey leash laws at Crissy Field. Furthermore, the Park Service should vigorously enforce full compliance, not just compliance at a 75 percent level.

Corr. ID: 4295

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209018

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very opposed to the recommendations that allow dogs off-leash on the Crissy Field beach and on-leash on the walking path. My children have gotten frightened by dogs and one of them was traumatized by a vicious dog fight nearby. My kids wander around and like to pick up pebbles and sand. There is sometimes dog poop that is not cleaned up. It is not a safe environment for small children.

I urge you to consider changing the proposed plan. Dogs should not be allowed off-leash on the beach. Indeed, I think that dogs should not be allowed on the beach at all unless it is a designated, fenced area.

And dogs should not be allowed on the path. It is too crowded, full of adults, kids, bikes. Children are vulnerable and must be protected.

Corr. ID: 4315

Organization: State of California Department of Fish and Game

Comment ID: 209391

Organization Type: State Government

Representative Quote: Crissy Field

The NPS Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) differs from the Environmentally Preferable Alternative in the designation of a ROLA along the shoreline of Central Beach. Under Alternative D, dogs would be prohibited in this area. As stated in the draft EIS, the adoption of Alternative C at this site is likely to result in minor adverse impacts to coastal dune vegetation; long-term moderate adverse impacts on shorebirds, gulls, terns and marine mammals; and long-term adverse impacts to the federally threatened western snowy plover. DFG recommends that Alternative D be selected as the adopted alternative as it, by prohibiting dogs from the Central Beach shoreline, would avoid impacts to coastal dune vegetation which may result from trampling, digging, and dog waste; impacts to birds which may result from repeated flushing; impacts to marine mammals which may result from biting, barking, or physical contact; and impacts to snowy plover which may result from harassment, including interruption of foraging and roosting behavior.

Concern ID:

29459

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters do not agree with the Preferred Alternative because the changes proposed are either not justified, not based upon sound science, or they do not agree that wildlife and listed species are negatively affected by off-leash dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4038

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207209

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly disagree with the GGNRA's preferred alternatives for Crissy Field, and for the other GGNRA dog areas, because all these alternatives greatly restrict and eliminate off-leash dog walking. I conclude that the author(s) of these alternatives are biased against off-leash dogs. Worse still, the proposed changes to the existing conditions (1979 Pet Policy) at Crissy Field are not based upon sound science or long-term monitoring of the site-specific conditions. The DEIS simply fails to justify its preferred alternative that would exclude off-leash dogs at the East Beach at Crissy Field.

Corr. ID: 4058

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207563

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I write again to add another fatal criticism of the DEIS for the so-called preferred alternative for Crissy Field. I have years of firsthand, eye-witness experience at Crissy Field with off-leash dogs, beach users, picnickers, and the protection of the vegetation, as well as the snowy plover (to which a section of the west beach is dedicated, without dogs, for a period of time each year).

This DEIS and Plan doesn't recognize that environmental values include both recreation and nature. In far too many places, the DEIS treats the environment and recreation as adversarial values: the DEIS erroneously assumes that recreation only harms natural resources. That document utterly fails to acknowledge that people care about both recreation and natural resources, and that most all of the people with off-leash dogs at Crissy Field and the East Beach are responsible, careful stewards of our environment.

This bias in the DEIS is especially salient in the discussions relating to Crissy Field; the false justifications for the so-called preferred alternative pits recreation against natural values and erroneously assumes that harm "could" result to the environment, when there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary. To the extent that any fix" is needed for something that is definitely not broken, the DEIS fails to identify or explore reasonable alternatives where nature and recreation can and do thrive together.

Not only is there no specific evidence of any significant PAST degradation at Crissy Field and East Beach. The proposed broad limitations in the DEIS for the East Beach and Crissy Field as a whole are largely without site-specific science demonstrating that the ANTICIPATED degradation of the quality of the natural resources would actually be attributable to off-leash dogs as opposed to other factors. There are so many other users of that area (e.g, children with inattentive or irresponsible parents; sail boarders; alcohol users; picnickers; sports participants; beach litterers) that the DEIS fails to consider as potential causes of any anticipated degradation.

Corr. ID: 4581

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209698

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Moreover, there is inadequate consideration of the impact of restricting off leash dogs on east beach at Crissy Field on the families that gather there for recreation. Both of my children grew up sharing Crissy Field east beach with their first dog. During many months of the year central beach is not safe because of the high tides. The proposal does not adequately investigate the impact on families of having to use Central Beach year round rather than east beach. There is also no science based explanation for moving off leash dogs off east beach. Please evaluate these alternatives and impacts. Major urban areas such as San Francisco need more places to recreate with dogs off leash, not fewer.

The GGNRA was created with the purpose of providing recreational opportunities for people. This includes off leash walking at sites like Crissy Field. The citizens of

San Francisco benefit greatly from these opportunities. Please do not restrict off leash walking on these sites.

Corr. ID: 4645 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208967 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned with the GGNRA's Preferred Alternative plan as it severely limits and affects the off leash dog walking areas at both Crissy Field and at Fort Funston. The Preferred Alternative slashes off-leash areas by nearly 90% - including areas that have traditionally been off-leash, voice control areas - including Fort Funston and the East Beach at Crissy Field. The Preferred Alternative is too restrictive. There is no justification in the DEIS for major changes in access and upon that basis I oppose it.

Concern ID:

29460

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters are under the impression that dogs will be banned from Crissy Field entirely, not allowed on the beach at Crissy Field, or not allowed in off-leash areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3556 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203463 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As it stands, the Draft Dog Management Plan for GGNRA will bring about many more problems than the minor ones it hopes to alleviate. Here is my own personal example:

I live near the Panhandle, and I walk my dog to the Presidio (Crissy Field) at least twice a week. Since I can walk my dog through the Presidio to get to Crissy, I walk. If the Dog Management Plan is accepted I will be forced to drive to the Presidio. Since thousands of local dog owners do the same thing, they will be forced to drive as well.

Consider all the extra car traffic and gridlock that will be caused by this plan - a very serious (unintended) environmental consequence of changing the current policy. I suggest that the dog policies as currently enforced remain in place.

Corr. ID: 3645 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204547 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These are my personal comments and observations regarding this plan: As a native San Franciscan, I am reminded daily of how fortunate I am to have a home town that some people can only dream of visiting. A huge part of that great fortune is the time I am able to spend in the GGNRA with my dog, Joe. He's really at his happiest on the beach, and I am so grateful that we can enjoy that together. We're at Fort Funston and Crissy Field at a couple of times a week. It would be such a great loss to so many if we lost access to these areas as places to walk our dogs.

Corr. ID: 3897 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206418 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I first came to the Presidio of San Francisco as a Soldier in 1987. I have returned since leaving active service many, many times. Walking Crissy Field beach with my dogs where I used to run on duty or in the woods around the old Magazine. The opportunity for my dogs to run in the surf or play in the long grass are some of my best memories with pets now gone and some of my favorite photos of these lost friends and members of my family. The majority of pet owners, the majority of all park users, are responsible. We carry bags to clean up dog waste. We monitor our dogs when off leash and ensure they behave properly. Dogs need places to run. They need places that smell wild. Dogs that are exercised properly are happy, well behaved and socialized. Please don't remove the dog off leash areas. Because I lived there, because I kept the grounds as one of many Soldiers there, I think of the park as my past home. I enjoy now returning

with my family which includes my dog to walk and remember my time there. Removing the off leash or dog allowable areas would diminish the experience. Keep the park accessible and enjoyable for all.

Concern ID: 29461

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters state that the impacts included in the DEIS are inconsistent with the FONSI for the Crissy Field development that concluded that there was no significant impact in maintaining the 1979 Pet Policy off leash areas and was based on a condition that any limitation in off leash access would only be made after a public hearing before the Advisory Committee.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2061 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193318 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -Crissy Field FONSI needs to be reconciled with inconsistent process used in DEIS for environmental impact analysis.

-Crissy Field FONSI promises that no derivation from the 1979 policy will be made without a public hearing.

Corr. ID: 4659 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209076 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While I appreciate the incentive and noble effort to attract wildlife to some areas, and enjoy seeing the progress in the lagoon area of Crissy Field, I believe pushing such goals over beach access results in a substantial improper deviation from the recreational mandate. For that reason I oppose the portions of the Preferred Alternative that further limit off leash access at Crissy Field. I note that the FONSI for the Crissy Field development concluded that there was no significant impact in maintaining the 1979 Pet Policy off leash areas and was based on a condition that any limitation in off leash access would only be made after a public hearing before the Advisory Committee. That FONSI conclusion appears inconsistent with the DEIS.

Concern ID: 29462

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose portions of the Preferred Alternative because the limitations placed on the grassy area of Crissy Field in connection with events should be described in more detail because, as written, GGNRA could potentially always have events planned in the area and the Airfield could potentially always be off limits to people with dogs; it is suggested that there should be limits placed on the number and frequency of the events if they are to cause limits on access with dogs.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 209228 (MH1200), Comment 209695.

Concern ID: 31868

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative because they feel Crissy Field is not a pristine area, and does not contain important vegetation. The impacts from dogs in these areas are small, as they are already largely degraded.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2926 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203438 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Since the Army left the Presidio, there have been many changes and despite the fact that the Haas Foundation stipulated that off leash dogs would be allocated some 70 acres (I believe it is) for this purpose, this is being totally ignored and ever since there has been an ongoing battle to change this.

There has been for some time an anti dog movement resulting in the situation we

now find ourselves, by people who do not understand that dogs are members of the family by those who own + love them.

I do understand the need for an area for families to enjoy without dogs and the East Beach is a logical choice being close to the car park. A number of families combine dogs + children which means they will have to find an alternative.

I do not understand why the Airfield should be reduced to the scale suggested. The Air Field is a swamp inhabited by gophers. Events are rare + should there be one, it surely would not be difficult to keep the public away temporarily.

Most of the fence protecting the Berm is almost none existent and getting worse. On otherhand the fence separating the West Beach is under constant discussion, should it be back to a few yards or not? I have never seen more than six snowy plovers who are not in leash bit troubled when we walk there with our dogs on leash!

I worry about the constant shrinking of space for dogs. This can only result in more people flocking to Crissy which also is being reduced giving those who only require any excuse to be rid of us all together.

Crissy is a joy to many, its true it can get crowded at peak hours and at week ends, on nice days, but frequently is very quiet-

I find it odd that nothing is ever said about people cycling in the promenade which is no different from a sidewalk- particularly since so many bike lanes have been made available to them.

CF1300 - Crissy Field: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29463

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support Alternative A because there is no problem with the current use of the area and no reason to limit the on-leash or off-leash dog areas at Crissy Field; reducing off-leash areas would diminish the enjoyment of this site, cause overcrowding in other off-leash dog areas or would not allow disabled (or mobility impaired) persons or families easy access to ROLAs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 480

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181796

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The NPS has already increasingly limited the areas of the GGNRA where voice control off-leash. Please do not limit them any further. The GGNRA has vast amounts of land where no dogs at all are permitted. I have yet to see anything put forward by the GGNRA which would provide reason to limit them further at Chrissy Field or Fort Funston. Please leave these two areas as they are.

Corr. ID: 518

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181928

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a dog owner and use Crissy Field to exercise her quite often. I think that carving up that area into on-leash and off-leash areas would wreck the space and create more confusion. To that end, I think that the alternative map, Map 10A, is preferable. There aren't many off-leash areas like Crissy Field, with its large area and easy accessibility.

Corr. ID: 629

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181317

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Mr. Dean, please allow Fort Funston to remain as it is; open to dog walkers, dog owners, sky- gliders, horseback riders, etc.

Please allow Crissy Field to remain as it is.

The idea of Muir Beach forbidding dogs to be off-leash entirely would be a tragedy for people who live nearby.

Corr. ID: 758 **Organization:** Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Comment ID: 185478 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My comments concern Chrissy Field, However, it would be an unnecessary restriction to enforce leash laws on the beach. Up until now, families and dogs have happily co-existed here and the quality of enjoyment would be considerably diminished if that privilege would be restricted.

Corr. ID: 815 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186073 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs should continue to be allowed to be off-leash at Fort Funston at all times as this is a real asset and crucial to dog owners in the city. Current leash restrictions for dogs off leash at Ocean Beach, Baker Beach and Crissy Fields are fine as is.

Corr. ID: 1062 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192179 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I walk my dog at Ocean Beach in the area approved for off-leash dogs. Out of all the miles of beach, this is a relatively tiny area and it is much appreciated. I go every week at least once and sometimes 3 times a week. I have never seen any misbehavior of any dogs over the past 4 years. Furthermore, it helps socialize dogs so that they are not a problem in contact with other dogs and people.

We now have more owners of dogs than parents of children. We pay taxes for education and recreation for families...well our dogs are our families and they deserve a place to play and interact, as well.

PLEASE do not revoke the current privileges of off-leash access for our dogs where we can currently go...ie, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field Beach, etc.

If possible, please confirm receipt and acknowledgement of this message

Corr. ID: 2015 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193226 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have a well trained 10-yr old lab + I walk her almost every day on Crissy Field. I pick up after her. She needs to run, so walking her on a leash wouldn't do it. I am a senior citizen + can't access (mobility issues) the proposed ROLA areas.

Corr. ID: 2830 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201147 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a frequent visitor to Chrissy field and I see no reason to change the existing dog walking rules. On most days 80% of the beach goers are walking/playing with their dogs and everyone has got along just fine with that for years. Why change something that is working so well?

Concern ID: 29464

CONCERN STATEMENT: [There is support Alternative E because it provides a balance of use, including a ROLA for the entire Airfield at Crissy Field and/or it provides a beach ROLA.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2342 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195386 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In regards to the Crissy Field site I respectfully submit that

Alternative E is the best compromise solution for this site. The open grassy area of air field should remain available to dogs under voice control. I do not see where restricting this area is justified.

Corr. ID: 2799

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201145

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a resident and dog owner in the City of San Francisco, I have enjoyed hundreds of Saturday mornings walking my dog at Crissy Field. Crissy Field is one of the few clean, safe and open areas where dogs can run and play off leash in the City. Being able to run and play off leash is essential to a dogs well being.

Over the years I have observed that most dog owners are responsible, maintain control of their dogs and clean up after them. Thus I believe the current arrangement works fairly well, and I prefer alternative A of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. However I understand the desire for a better defined policy and greater restrictions and thus alternative E is my second choice. Given how muddy the Crissy Field air field is in the winter and how many burs and foxtails it has in the spring, a beach off leash option is important for dogs and central beach makes the most sense since east beach and the promenade are used by most other park visitors.

Corr. ID: 4061

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207610

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am supportive of Chrissy Field map option E this provides the best balance of dog and non-dog access and usage.

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

29465

Commenters support Alternative D because it will provide protection for wildlife and habitat as well as listed species, including the Western Snowy Plover.

Corr. ID: 2553

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200792

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As the mother of a small child, my family often uses the West beach area near the Warming Hut. During the times of year when it is not snowy plover season, and thus leashes required, we often have dogs running around the beach without their owners closeby. The dogs frequently come right up to the small children and sometimes scare them, and their parents. I have even seen dogs fighting with one another around small children. Thankfully I have never seen anyone hurt, but it is very disconcerting and frightening for children. There is also the problem of dog poop on the family beach. Due to these reasons, I would support the separation of dogs and the requirement for leashes in most areas. There should be dog-free areas for those people, and of course for the endangered species, who do not enjoy being around dogs that are not on leash. San Francisco has plenty of dog-friendly parks

Corr. ID: 3858

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208907

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Chrissy Field I support Map 10-D. The main reason for this is that this area is important to the western Snowy Plover, which is listed as a threatened species under the federal Endangered Species Act.

Corr. ID: 4071

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207753

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Crissy Field and Ocean Beach I support Alternative D. Absolutely no ROLA should be allowed anywhere near threatened or endangered species habitat, including Ft. Funston.

Concern ID: 29466
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative B for Crissy Field for reasons including the entire Airfield is open to off-leash dogs and the WPA will not allow dogs.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1488 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191285 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: At Crissy Field, I prefer Alternative B for the East and Central beaches because those beaches are currently receiving tremendous off-leash dog pressure, and because on-leash restrictions are more consistent with the preferred alternative along the promenade there. The decision to make the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area off limits to dogs is correct, and will be easier to enforce if dog use adjacent to this area is on-leash only.

Concern ID: 30876
CONCERN STATEMENT: Alternative E should be selected for Crissy Field because it would allow one large ROLA on the airfield and would be readily enforceable.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1210 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 194849 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Crissy Field, Airfield: Instead of Alternative C, which is too complicated and very difficult to enforce, you should select Alternative E, which allows dogs off leash on the whole airfield, except as dictated by special events. Trying to enforce C, would be extremely difficult and very management intensive.

CF1400 - Crissy Field: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29470
CONCERN STATEMENT: No Dog Areas - Commenters suggest having more areas for a no dog experience including the freshwater swale (east of the lagoon), on some of the paths/trails that lead to the beach, path to the fishing pier, and the eastern portion of the airfield. In addition dogs should not be allowed within building including the lavatories. Reasoning for banning dogs from these areas included a need for a visitor experience without dogs, multiple visitor use of the areas, natural resource protection, and protection of restoration areas and efforts.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3080 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 201299 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: While I think the preferred alternatives presented in the dog management plan will help decrease the number of disruptive encounters that children have with dogs, I believe there is still room for improvement in this area. Specifically, it appears that there are several park areas where there aren't any trails that will be "dog-free." An example of this is Crissy Field; the preferred alternative calls for a beach area that doesn't allow for dogs but it seems that all the pathways leading to that beach do allow for dogs. I would support some access points that would allow families to reach the beach without having to deal with dogs. I believe that there should be some trails and/or paths that do not allow dogs (on-leash or off) in each area of the park. The park is a shared resource and adults who do not wish to encounter dogs and/or do not want their children to encounter dogs during their park visits should have that opportunity.
Corr. ID: 3608 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon
Comment ID: 220104 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The eastern portion of the airfield should be a no-dog area. The Crissy airfield attracts a wide variety of bird species, including rare vagrants, and is a popular venue for wildlife viewing. I often visit this site to view the

migrating hawks in the fall, the Western Meadowlarks each fall through spring, and I had the opportunity to see a rare species - the Red-throated Pipit, at this site.

Corr. ID: 4244

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209217

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a frequent user of the GGNRA, especially Crissy Field. My concerns are for the natural restoration. It is amazing. My worry is that dogs loving, lovable, and popular + polulous as they are will undermine this huge and successful endeavor. I see few birds there now which tells me they know dogs are everywhere - some leashed + some not. This seems an incomplete restoration because of dogs here.

I love dogs and dogs need parks and ocean areas to swim in. They need a big designated dog park of their own - in SF. To be allowed here and there means they go everywhere - due to signage problems and owners lacking respect or whatever.

My point- Crissy Field area should not have dogs at all.

Corr. ID: 4296

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209015

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am an older woman who lives near Crissy Field and that is the only park I can get to easily. So, my comments are going to be limited to that portion of the report.

Secondly, I am against the allowance of dogs on leash on the path that runs from the near parking lot to the fishing pier. Very large numbers of people use this path. The dogs, even on leash, jump, bark and poop. There are accidents with bikers. Furthermore, if dogs are allowed off leash on the grassy airfield, who will patrol their getting onto the path on-leash? The dogs will continue to run, as they do now, between the field and the path, back and forth. In all the years I've been walking on that path, I've never seen any enforcement, not once.

I am distressed that the one park nearest to the largest concentration of people will be given over to the dogs. Let the dogs run free in a more remote area.

Corr. ID: 4526

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209612

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I ask also that you develop more rigorous enforcement designed to keep dogs out of the public lavatories along Crissy Field. In spite of adequate signage, too many dogs are taken into the stalls or are lounging inside the buildings while the owners use the facilities.

Corr. ID: 4584

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220095

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy East of the Lagoon ' The Freshwater Swale should be designated on the area maps as a no dog zone.

Concern ID:

29471

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Fencing - Commenters suggested multiple areas within Crissy Field to place fencing around ROLAs. At Central Beach, fencing should be placed around the Central Beach ROLA to protect the Wildlife Protection Area and lagoon outlet and also along the dunes. Fencing should also be placed around Crissy East Beach to protect the lagoon outlet area. A moveable barrier or fencing should also be placed around the Crissy Airfield ROLA to set a distinguished boundary for off-leash dog walking. Lastly, the east and west perimeters of the Wildlife Protection Area should be fenced and a vegetative barrier should surround the tidal marsh.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220098 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field - - The Plan calls for making half the field available for off leash and half for on leash only but contemplates no barrier between the two areas. It will be very difficult for dog walkers to even see where the separation point occurs much less observe it.

Corr. ID: 2680 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220112 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the park's preferred alternative for Crissy Field with the following comments:

3. WPA -- both the east and the west perimeters of the Crissy WPA should be fenced.

Corr. ID: 2905 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202641 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Central Beach - The Central Beach ROLA should be fenced and gated. Fences at the west and east ends should extend to the water at extreme low tide. Adequate buffer zones (~300ft) should be included beyond the west and east boundary fences to protect the WPA and the lagoon outlet from the influences of excessive dog play activity. Access points from the promenade should be gated. Signs should be posted clearly identifying the area as an off-leash dog play area and stating the voice and sight control rules.

Crissy East Beach - Fencing should be installed to protect the lagoon outlet zone. Outlet areas from bodies of water into bays or oceans are of high habitat value. The outlet zone should be included as part of the protected lagoon area and similarly fenced.

The airfield ROLA should have some type of physical barrier along the boundaries. A physical barrier will clearly define the ROLA area. Clearly defined boundaries will maximize compliance and minimize conflict. Consider a movable barrier that can be set up and taken down as needed. Signs should be posted clearly identifying the area as an off-leash dog play area and stating the voice and sight control rules.

Corr. ID: 2905 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219009 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field WPA - The DEIS indicates that the east boundary fence will be relocated 200 feet eastward at a position 900 feet from the NOAA pier (p. 60). The language of the plan should allow the National Park Service flexibility in determining the exact location of the fence and consideration should be given to the visual penetration effect as well as the geographical conditions of the immediate area.

Under the preferred alternative, off-leash dog activity directly adjacent to the east boundary fence will pose a visual threat that will penetrate into the Wildlife Protection Area, effectively rendering a portion of the eastern WPA as non-viable habitat during daytime use hours. Given this concern, the fence should be placed a reasonable distance eastward, beyond the actual 900 foot border line, to allow for an adequate buffer zone.

Additionally, the geography of the area of fence placement is somewhat complicated by non-uniform conditions which include a variety of substrates, varying elevations, several lobes of fenced dune habitat areas, and a variety of pedestrian pathways. Consideration should be given to all of these conditions and fence placement should be such that will accommodate ease of pedestrian traffic

flow while maintaining adequate protection of the WPA.

When installed, the fence should extend to the water at extreme low tide.

Corr. ID: 2965

Organization: Urban Estuary Network

Comment ID: 220128

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Wildlife Protection Area at Crissy Field needs to be stoutly fenced off all the way around it and down to the low tide line. LARGE signs with a plover logo need to be plastered along the fence right down to the littoral zone. People walking along the beach often just do not see the signs down there.

Creating a ROLA in the center of the Airfield might bring more dogs down to the WPA. The ROLA needs to have fencing to mark its perimeter.

Corr. ID: 3195

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220124

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think the GGNRA should provide better signage and create more environmental barriers where necessary, such as the vegetative barriers surrounding the tidal marsh at Crissy Field. In all my time at Crissy Field, I have seen very few incidents of dogs going beyond the fences that enclose the dunes or the marsh, and even fewer incidents of dog aggression. I have never seen a dog be aggressive to an adult or a child. With the many dogs that are there on weekdays, and the hundreds that are there on weekends, I think that is quite remarkable, and certainly does not justify the restrictions being put forth in the GGNRA's preferred alternative.

Corr. ID: 3608

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon

Comment ID: 203972

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Crissy airfield regulated off-leash area should have a distinct demarcation along the boundaries. A clear fence or other boundary is necessary to clearly maximize compliance and minimize conflict. Signs should clearly identify the area as an off-leash dog play area with posted regulations.

Corr. ID: 3937

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205875

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Generally, when I visit the SPWPA there are numerous off-leash dogs, even though the SPWPA is signed for on-leash use only during the times of year when I am there. (The reports of the Snowy Plover census also show significant non-compliance with the on-leash requirement.) As a result I generally don't see any Snowy Plovers. One evening, I visited at a time when there were no dogs present, and the Snowy Plovers were readily visible. I am afraid that if there is not a significant barrier between the ROLA and the SPWPA, numerous off-leash dogs will enter the SPWPA. Accordingly, if the ROLA and the no dog areas are immediately adjacent to each other, it will be necessary to erect a barrier between the two that dogs will be unable to cross. Before erecting such a barrier the NPS will need to consider whether such a barrier will have any adverse effect on the Snowy Plovers (e.g., by providing perches for bird predators).

Corr. ID: 4337

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209086

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have looked at the GGNRA dog management plan and I am very concerned about the part pertaining to Crissy Field. The dogs run around, some are aggressive. I don't feel safe with my children on the beach or on the walkway.

I do not think that is right to allow dogs to run free on the beach nor should they be allowed on the central path. I recommend that you fence in a portion of the meadow 'airfield and allow that to be used by dogs.

Corr. ID: 4410

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206946 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Crissy East Beach ' Fencing should be installed to protect the lagoon outlet zone. Outlet areas from bodies of water into bays or oceans are of high habitat value. The outlet zone should be included as part of the protected lagoon area and similarly fenced.

Corr. ID: 4527 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209613 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Generally, I have observed that dog owners at Crissy Field are responsible and clean (thanks in large part to many strategically placed waste bag dispensers which are filled every day by Crissy Field Dog Group volunteers) and really do respect the "Wildlife Protection Area.". (SUGGESTION: The dunes on the Central Beach at Crissy Field are in great need of a higher, dog-proof barrier on the ocean side.)

Concern ID: 29472

CONCERN STATEMENT: Compliance - The compliance rate should be increased from 75 percent to 90 or 95 percent and a reporting system should be established.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2680 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195490 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I support the park's preferred alternative for Crissy Field with the following comments:

1. compliance requirements should be higher than 75 percent. Something more in line with 90 to 95 percent would make a better visitor experience and encourage less cheating. I appreciate that it may take some time to get to that compliance level, but it would help people like me work with the dog folks if it is that high.

Corr. ID: 2905 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220102 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Crissy Promenade - I support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, one dog per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Concern ID: 29473

CONCERN STATEMENT: Site Accessibility - Commenters suggest that accessibility from the parking area to the beach ROLA at Crissy Field and the Airfield be changed to be made more accessible to disabled (or mobility impaired) persons or for families.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29454 (CF1200), Comments 202246, 190935, and 192053.

Concern ID: 29474

CONCERN STATEMENT: Time Restrictions - Commenters suggested setting time of use restrictions for off-leash dog walking. Suggestions included allowing dogs off-leash at East Beach in the early morning and evening on the weekends to allow time for sunbathers to use the beach without dogs. In addition, a temporary no dog restriction could be implemented on "Good weather" days at East Beach. Commenters also suggested making the leash restriction less strict during the weekdays when families are less likely to use the site. Similar time restrictions should be implemented on the Airfield.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1222 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194871 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: We have a dog -- she loves the water and Crissy Field.

However, I am also a parent.

My suggestions are:

-- Ease up the proposed restrictions during the week when families are less likely to be there.

-- If Central Beach is to be the main location then facilities for washing down the dog, bathrooms, etc. should be put into place -- when one's child wants to use a bathroom it is a long walk.

Corr. ID: 1574

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190788

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 10-E seems logical (Crissy Field)

It is preferable to have off leash time limits on East Beach:

Before 9: AM

After 5: PM

Dogs should NOT allowed in Wildlife Protection Area (WPA)

Corr. ID: 2685

Organization: Neighbor

Comment ID: 195485

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I understand there are a few relatively warm, relatively windless days each year when sunbathers (not many swimmers!) like to use East Beach - and yes, I appreciate that a sunbather may occasionally be slightly inconvenienced by a discourteous dog and/or host. For these rare days (in my experience, only 4-5/year), the GGNRA could easily implement a temporary restriction on off-leash dogs on East Beach and redirect their hosts to the beach west of the lagoon's outlet.

Corr. ID: 2813

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201115

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crowding will create problems

The Preferred Alternative at Crissy Field, by eliminating dogs from the East Beach particularly during weekday hours, and the airfield also largely empty during the week, will force greater interaction between a greater number of dogs and their owners (especially during high tides) in a much smaller area. One reason that there are relatively few problems with dog aggression is that there is enough space at Crissy for everyone to interact when they wish to and not because density has been forced on them. Solution: Make the East Beach and parts of the Airfield off limits between 10 to 4 on weekends. Allow full use during the week.

Concern ID:

29475

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Wildlife Protection Area - Commenters feel that the Wildlife Protection Area should be closed off to both dog walkers and other visitors. It has been suggested to close the WPA to humans, close the WPA to both humans and dogs, create buffers near the WPA, or place a fence in the vicinity of the WPA to protect and reduce disturbance to the Western Snowy Plover.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1067

Organization: GGRO

Comment ID: 192189

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to see Crissy field continue the way it has been with

a loose leash law except in the areas where the snowy plovers spend the winter. This area should be protected more and be closed to both dogs and people.

I often go to Crissy field with my little dog and my binoculars. She needs the exercise and loves being off leash. I fret about her loss of

freedom which she will feel as any person would.

Corr. ID: 1774 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220320 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed Regulated Off-Leash Dog Area at Crissy Field is problematic due to its adjacency to a wildlife protection area.

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192059 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: iii The DEIS bans dogs entirely from the WPA at Crissy Field. Comment: The DEIS fails to provide scientific support for the claim that dogs are the only factor disturbing Snowy Plover and other shorebirds in these areas. The DEIS should examine the effects of human disturbance as well. The DEIS should also ban humans from the portion of the WPA that lies between Central Beach (where dogs are permitted) and the Coast Guard Station. Human activity (children play, kite boarders practicing, etc) is regularly observed in this section of the WPA. If we really want to give the Snowy Plovers a chance, we should give them a place without human disturbance as well.

Concern ID:

29476

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

ROLAs - Commenters suggest adding more off-leash areas or changing the locations of the ROLAs at Crissy Field. Suggestions included changing the Tidal Area from on-leash to a ROLA, adding a ROLA on East Beach, on the beach from sewer pipe to the sand ladder trail, on the beach from the bridge to the warming hut (including the large grass area), on the beach from the bridge to the St. Francis Yacht Club, and along the airstrip. Fenced ROLAs should be established south and east of the parking lots.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 5 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181404 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding proposal for Crissy Field: So for this area (again the tidal area) I would respectfully request this be changed from leash only to "voice control" or be off limits only to large dogs who are safer playing in the surf, maybe allowing access only to dogs <20lbs who are less likely to have an impact on children and families in the area. Otherwise the proposal at Crissy Field makes sense.

Corr. ID: 235 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180755 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would keep the "no dog area", but make the beach (to the South) between the access trail and the sewer outlet pipe an on leash area. The beach from the pipe to the sand ladder trail could ROLA. This would provide a landmark (the pipe) to define the two areas. It would also allow dogs to access the "voice control" area from the North or South. I think it provides plenty of beach for ROL.

Regarding Crissy Field; I don't think it is workable to have ROLA at the water line. I think sections of beach have to be designated as I proposed for Ft. Funston.

Corr. ID: 863 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190031 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I can understand that non dog owners would like to enjoy areas of the parks dog free, and I think that there is room for some compromise. However, I am strongly against taking away large off leash areas. I take my dog to Chrissy Fields weekly and the following is an example of what I feel would be a good compromise:

If you are walking north/ west, off leash would be permitted after the small bridge; all along the beach, all the way down to the warming hut and also the large grass

area on the left down to the warming hut. The first part of the beach (by the parking lot) would give people a dog free environment as well as the picnicking area by the warming hut, but dogs would still have ample space to run and play.

Corr. ID: 1622

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190918

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Let the dogs be off leash from the St. Francis Yacht Club to the Bridge.

Corr. ID: 1812

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191796

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've read through the proposal and am unable to find any reason for the recommendation of reducing the off leash use of the Crissy Field airstrip. (The proposal recommends reducing it by two thirds.) My dog needs a large space to exercise off leash and the airstrip is an ideal size and surface. I use off leash facilities in the East Bay - the dog park at Cesar Chavez Park in Berkeley, Point Isabel, and the East Bay Regional Parks. All of them have problems. In the summer, the wild areas are hazardous because of foxtails and other grass seeds. In the Regional Parks there are problems with ticks, rattlesnakes, and poison oak. I can understand that the needs of wildlife are important, but the airfield is not a wildlife habitat. It's irrigated and mowed and located in the middle of a developed area. I see no reason to change its usage from the current arrangement.

Corr. ID: 2685

Organization: Neighbor

Comment ID: 195484

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As mentioned, I'm a neighbor and am fortunate to visit Crissy Field several times a week. Although I normally hike on the main path, I always see off-leash dogs on East Beach with their hosts and everyone is having a great time. On the East Beach, there is very little vegetation and, to my knowledge, no endangered wildlife, so I don't understand why you want to make East Beach off limits to unleashed dogs.

In my rather extensive experience at Crissy Field on a year-around basis, dogs and their hosts are easily the most frequent and enthusiastic users of East Beach. On windy days, windsurfers put time in down there, but they seem to be pleased with the company of other beach enthusiasts, including off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 4221

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220125

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field - A fenced dog run should be established south of the parking lots for off-leash dog activity with a dirt surface (not sand, asphalt or concrete) where dogs can run, socialize and defecate, with a gathering area for the dog owners to congregate including benches. There should be a substantial dog-run at the east end parking lot (perhaps 50' by 150'), and a much smaller one at the west end of the Crissy area in close proximity to a parking lot.

Concern ID:

29477

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters suggest a registration/license requirement or fee for dog use at the site, ticketing for enforcement, educating citizens, creating a definition for "voice control" (such as 30 to 60 seconds to respond to a command), or creating dog wash down areas at Central Beach where the ROLA is proposed.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 332

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181097

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been using crissy field for the last two years with my dog. I have always been respectful and so have the members of the community that I see at crissy field. The best thing to do is license the dogs for off-leash use and fine those that are not license.

Corr. ID: 2318

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195273

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If current regulations continue, the NPS could consider a day-use payment system to offset maintenance fees, if necessary, such as what's in place at Muir Woods. I would certainly pay a \$5 fee every time I used Crissy Field; professional dog walkers could be required to purchase permits as well, as one of the alternatives suggests.

Corr. ID: 4606

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210102

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Mitigate Adverse Impacts in Alternative A without banning off leash dogs.

1. Western Snowy Plover at Crissy Field.

Western Snowy Plover Monitoring at the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area of the Presidio of San Francisco and the Relative Impact of Human Disturbance 2006/2007. Golden Gate Audubon, San Francisco, California (Zlatunich, M. 2007) shows off leash dog disturbances of snowy plovers at Crissy Field dropped from 2.35 per survey hour to 0.62 per survey hour after minimal "outreach and education." Signs were posted at the WPA and a brochure was passed out on-site for one week, November 3 ' 11, 2006. That minimal effort produced a dramatic decline in disturbances of the plovers by off leash dogs. Ongoing outreach and education at the Crissy Field WPA (as well as on Ocean Beach) could alleviate a great deal of the claimed adverse impact by off leash dogs on WSP. The DEIS makes no attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of such mitigation when considering Alternative A.

The drastic restrictions on off leash recreation proposed for Ocean Beach would also be unnecessary if reasonable management were implemented there.

Corr. ID: 4664

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209142

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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.

Concern ID:

29562

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

On-Leash - Dogs should be leashed on the promenade from the parking lot to Crissy Field to try to remove the dangers of having off-leash dogs in the same area as runners, bikers, and other user groups. Other suggestions for on-leash areas included the following: on East Beach east of the stream to allow both a dog and no dog experience within this area, on-leash within Central Beach to prevent dogs from accessing the tidal marsh areas, foot paths that cross the airfield, and multi-use trails.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 417

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181587

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field (proposed Plan C): Under the current proposal, dogs would be banned from East Beach and the Wildlife Protection Area, but Central Beach would remain off-leash. Crissy Field is perhaps the most popular beach in San Francisco for dog owners, and where the dog owner community (as part of the greater community) is most prevalent. Therefore, Central Beach should, in fact, remain off-leash. East Beach shouldn't ban dogs, but instead require they be on-leash east of the stream, off-leash starting west of the stream (the course

changes, so this would be a changing boundary). This would allow families with both children and dogs to have the East Beach for picnics, etc... enabling them to have an undisturbed experience while still having their dog with them (on-leash), as it can be a hindrance for families with both children and dogs to find a place safe and accepting of both. However, those who are there with just dogs would, by default, naturally forgo East Beach in favor of Central Beach (few would want their dog on-leash when an off-leash alternative is just steps away, so even allow leashed dogs on East Beach would provide a relatively dog-less experience for those who choose).

Corr. ID: 900 **Organization:** Retired

Comment ID: 191256 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My comments are to encourage you to enforce a leash law/requirement at Crissy Field. I have been attack or tripped during my walk several times. I see dogs attacking other small dogs, running in the habitat area, the lagoon, and generally ignored.

Corr. ID: 2025 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193242 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -Instead of no dogs on east beach please allow dogs on leash - this will not disturb people on the sand + extend dog walks + joy!

Corr. ID: 4410 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206949 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Airfield ' The foot paths that cross the airfield are multi-use trails and should be designated as on-leash areas. Allowing off-leash dogs on the airfield trails will lead to user conflicts.

Corr. ID: 4589 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210036 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are, however, some improvements that a modification could address for the positive, specifically as they relate to Crissy Field:

1. The crushed gravel promenade from the parking lots west past the grassy meadow is of particular concern. There are dogs on and off leash, bicycles, runners, pedestrians, children learning to ride bikes, etc. Surely you have seen on weekends it is a mob scene and recipe for accidents. Leashing dogs in this area and eliminating bicycles would certainly cut down on the risk of injuries to all users of the promenade.

Concern ID: 30903

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Signage - Instead of eliminating dog walking from certain areas within Crissy Field, the park should design and install better signage stating regulations and informing visitors of the Wildlife Protection Areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3195 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220123 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In many places, the DEIS treats the environment and recreation as opposing values, i.e., that recreation only harms natural resources. The reasonable response to this problem is to educate visitors, improve signage and help park visitors follow the rules and learn how to respect the environment, not to ban the rest of us with dogs from the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 4581 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220099 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Instead of taking away off leash areas, I think the GGNRA should consider adding new areas, and providing better signage and environmental barriers like the ones at Crissy Field. The draft Dog Management Plan and the

Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not evaluate the value of these recreational activities and does not adequately consider alternatives such as environmental barriers and providing better signage and education to the public.

Concern ID: 30908

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commercial Dog Walking - Commercial dog walking should not be allowed at Crissy Field. If commercial dog walking is allowed there should be few licenses allowed and they should not be treated the same as an individual dog walker.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1222 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220130 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We have a dog -- she loves the water and Crissy Field. However, I am also a parent.

My suggestions are:-- Dog walkers are a real problem: the last time I was there three dog walkers accounted for 21 dogs. They tend to hang out and talk to one another so they are like a tornado running down the beach. Basically they are a commercial enterprise and should not be treated the same as an Owner with a dog or two walking on the beach.

Corr. ID: 2680 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220111 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the park's preferred alternative for Crissy Field with the following comments:

2. commercial dog walking activity should not be allowed. While I appreciate that these folks are small businesses trying to make a living, the dogs beat up the environment, spook wildlife, and don't contribute to the visitor experience. At the very least, they should be licensed like any other business in the park and there should be a limited number of licenses.

Corr. ID: 4584 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220096 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Promenade ' I support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, one dog per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Concern ID: 30934

CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA - Commenters support removing the ROLA or changing the location of the ROLA on Crissy Beach to protect natural resources or to allow visitors who do not enjoy dogs at the beach a dog-free experience.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 258 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180842 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a frequent park user and feel like dogs on leash on large trails is a good thing. I don't think ROLAs belong in a National park. That use is suitable at local parks set up for that use without significant natural and cultural resources. I am particularly concerned with the ROLA on Crissy beach. So many significant natural resources are nearby.

Corr. ID: 1020 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191791 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very unhappy at the ROMA proposed for Central Beach - it is one of the best places in the city to walk in nature, and is already marred by the large numbers of dogs and dogwalkers there, over 30 dogs last time I was there. There would be even more dogs there under the proposed plan. The dogs should be ON lease in this area!

Corr. ID: 4071 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207751 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Western snowy plovers, Bank swallows, San Francisco garter snakes, Red legged frogs, Mission blue butterflies and Hickman's cinquefoil all the other endangered or threatened species need the best protection possible. Wherever protected species exist, as at Crissy Field and Ocean Beach, NO on or off-leash dogs should be allowed anywhere near sensitive habitat.

CO1000 – Coastal Zone Consistency Determination

There were no comments on CO1000

CO1100 - Comments Considered an Individual Concern Statement

For individual concern statements, please see Appendix A.

CR2010 - Cultural Resources: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 29401

CONCERN STATEMENT: The plan does not show the importance of the cultural resources, future cultural resources, or detrimental effects from dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192080 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With regard to the U.S. Coast Guard Station at Crissy Field, the DEIS states: "In the past some of the individual juniper plantings within the U.S. Coast Guard Station's perimeter hedge have died and dog urine is believed to have contributed to the loss of at least one plant." Comment: The DEIS fails to establish the materiality of one plant, the cause of death of one plant, and the relevance of one plant as a "cultural resource." The DEIS should be revised to remove the above reference entirely based on the following:

- The hedge is newly planted to replace the historic cypress hedge planted in 1915 that needed to be replaced due to age and effects of nearby remediation and renovation of Airfield, etc. The new plantings, particularly one plant, hardly fit into definition of a "cultural resource."

- Since more than one plant died, there were other factors at work than simply dog urine which is only cited as a possible contributing factor in the death of one plant.

- One of the buildings of the Coast Guard Station adjacent to the hedge has paint peeling down to the wood due to the weather effects that is a much more material problem with this cultural icon.

- There is ample evidence of "wear and tear" on grounds and facilities throughout the GGNRA lands due to the high level of use by people engaged in a variety of activities in this urban environment. The possible loss of one plant from dog urine should more appropriately be included in the general maintenance requirements for the area.

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192045 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS fails to provide evidence for impact of dogs on future plans for restoration and enhancement. The DEIS fails to demonstrate relevancy. Please remove this from objective.

Comment: The DEIS fails to prove relevance of future cultural projects. The DEIS should be revised to remove this as objective.

Comment: The DEIS fails to show any detrimental effects. The DEIS should be revised to reflect lack of evidence.

Concern ID:

29403

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters stated that many of the cultural resources described in the plan are not within dog walking areas and that impacts to cultural resources cannot be attributed to dog walking.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4016

Organization: San Francisco resident

Comment ID: 206833

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: - In referencing Chrissy Field the DEIS states "original buildings-hangars, barracks, guardhouse, etc." are included in the "Affected Environment". Most of these structures are located on the south side of Mason Street, geographically located across the street from the dog-walking boundary and in visits to the hangar areas of Chrissy Fields, dog-walking is not an activity found in this area where public and retail-oriented spaces are surrounded by parking areas.

Corr. ID: 4016

Organization: San Francisco resident

Comment ID: 206830

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: First, I am strongly opposed to GGNRA's inclusion of a many cultural resources in the DEIS when, simply-stated, many of these cultural resources are not within the dog-walking areas and some of the "negative activities" cited in this section cannot be attributed to dog-walking activities.

Corr. ID: 4679

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog

Comment ID: 227552

Organization Type: Civic Groups

Representative Quote: 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.

I would also point out the GGNRA has failed miserably in their restoration efforts for facilities such as the Cliff House which are within the Recreation Area's boundaries. The new facility is quite unaesthetic, and popular restaurants within have been altered and have lost their popularity. I have talked to many visitors who are familiar with the previous incarnations of the Cliff House. They always express their disappointment and/or outrage as to its boxy appearance with the service entrants in the most visible area. There used to be a line down the hill for the Sunday brunch at the Cliff House, now it is empty. Our cultural resources are in far greater danger from GGNRA management and their "restoration" plans than they are from dogs.

Concern ID:

29404

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Cultural resources within the Baker Beach dog walking area should be the only resources included in the plan and potential damage from dogs should be more

Representative Quote(s): [clear. These areas should also be located on a map.](#)
Corr. ID: 4016 **Organization:** San Francisco resident
Comment ID: 206834 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: - In reference to "Fort Winfield Scott" section of the DEIS, this section should be renamed to "Fort Winfield Scott Seacoast Fortifications" or entirely removed to itemize only embattlements that are contained within the Baker Beach dog-walking areas. In addition these fortifications should be itemized within the text and on the map in a consistent manner, and the "damage" that is caused by dog-walking activities to these fortifications should also be realistically discussed.

Concern ID: 29405
CONCERN STATEMENT: [The reference to "headquarters" at Fort Scott should not be included in the plan since they are located outside a dog walking area.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4016 **Organization:** San Francisco resident
Comment ID: 206835 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: - In addition, the mention of "headquarters" in the text of Fort Scott implies that the "campus" including the headquarters building, barracks buildings and parade grounds are part of the DEIS area of concern. These cultural resources are geographically distinct from all of the dog-walking areas included in the DEIS. The reference to the "headquarter" should be re-written clearly.

Concern ID: 29406
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters believe that the World War II battlements do not need to be preserved or protected since they had no actual involvement with the war. They should not be included as a cultural resource and do not need to be protected from dogs or from children playing on them.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2873 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202709 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The proposed rule changes at Fort Funston are not supportable by the document produced by the park service.

The park administration may wish that the park were different than it currently is but it has become a major drawing point for San Franciscans to recreate with each other and especially with their four legged companions

Restricting off leash use of the park to 10% of the land currently available is not supported by the science submitted here, and is in no way consistent with the historical use of this land.

The GGNR represents one of the last areas where inhabitants of the Bay Area can allow off leash recreation of their canine companions and the other areas are small fenced in patches of dirt distributed around the developed urban areas.

There are stated concerns regarding the preservation of rusting, rotting World War II battlements (which of course have no actual involvement with the war other than as visible tributes to overly rampant paranoia as they were never close to the war front). These are referred to as cultural resources and presented as something to protect although the real threat to their continued degradation are the children that play in them not the dogs that pass by.

There are hundreds of pages describing soils, geological features, endangered and unendangered wildlife and plants and a lot of speculation as to how dogs might impact each of them - which on most counts is minimal even when theoretical; but

there is almost no real science regarding the measured impact of dogs on any of these. The increasing presence of dogs is well documented and the authors of this proposition express a concern that the park resources and "values":
"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"

Of all the different benefits that the GGNRA can provide and promote, I would submit that the nurturing of the ongoing health and happiness of the Bay Area Canine population should be first not last in the list of aspirations for the park.

Last but not least dogs improve the quality of the lives of millions of regular folk in the U.S. The use of the GGNR to maintain the health and well being of these amazing creatures is a supportable and excellent use of the resource. Alternative "A" is the way to go.

Concern ID: 31778
CONCERN STATEMENT: Cultural resources in the GGNRA should not just include physical resources, but also the local culture, which is defined in part by dog walking.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4035 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 227708 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Recreation Heritage and Culture: The Park Service seems to attribute physical structures to Cultural Resources and is ignoring the important cultural components. The military structures and Native American heritage is important to preserve but so is the the development and maintenance of the local culture. Nothing is more fundamental to the Bay Area or the GGNRA than the community gatherings and bonding experiences that happen on beautiful days at high visitation places such as Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Fort Funston, Mori Point/Sharp Park, etc.

CR4000 - Cultural Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Concern ID: 29407
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters stated that off-lease dog walking should not be restricted to any part of Ocean Beach from the Cliff House south based on cultural resources because there are no significant cultural resources in that area.

For representative quotes, lease see Concern 29346 (OB1200), Comment 181130

Concern ID: 29408
CONCERN STATEMENT: It is not clear what is meant by "protect cultural resources from the detrimental effects of dog use"? The plan does not clearly state how dogs actually impact cultural resources (i.e., forts). Commenters believe that visitors impact the cultural resources more than dogs.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 377 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181164 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I do not actually see how dogs damage cultural resources. What can a dog do to a fort? Erosion does more than the dogs can ever do. Is there really some documentation about dog damage to cultural resources? You really do not say how the dogs damage such things.
Corr. ID: 1957 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192710 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: "Protect cultural resources from the detrimental effects of dog use" - what does this mean? How many dogs "use" cultural resources? Aren't people more likely to commit "detrimental effects"?"

CR5000- Cultural Resources: Cumulative Impacts

There were no comments on CR5000

CR6000- Cultural Resources: Impairment Analyses

There were no comments on CR6000

CS1100 - Cattle/Sweeney: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29311

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support not allowing dogs at Sweeney Ridge as part of the Preferred Alternative to protect wildlife, including the mission blue butterfly. In addition, visitors want a no-dog visitor experience at this site and also because the City of Pacifica is creating a new off-leash dog area for recreation.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3655 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204126 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support your proposal to only allow on leash dogs on Pacifica trails and no dogs on Sweeney Ridge. Off leash dogs chase wildlife and may bark at or threaten hikers.

Corr. ID: 3659 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204185 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would prefer to have dogs banned from Mori Point, Malagra Ridge, and Sweeney Ridge altogether....no leashed or unleashed dogs. I have done extensive hiking and biking at all locations mentioned and many dog owners begin their walks with their dogs on leash and then take the leash off when they get away from parking areas. I have seen dogs chasing birds, squirrels and other wildlife.

If all dogs are banned it is easier to regulate. There is no way that rangers and other law enforcement can make sure all dogs remain on leash. By eliminating all dogs one doesn't have to follow everyone to make sure they conform to leash law. Just keep all dogs out and don't worry about leash or no leash.

Pacifica is going to create a special dog recreation area where dog owner can run their dogs without leash.

Corr. ID: 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates

Comment ID: 209126 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: SWEENEY RIDGE. Dogs should be excluded from Sweeney Ridge to protect the habitat of the Mission Blue butterfly and other wildlife.

CS1200 - Cattle/Sweeney: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29362

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative because it bans dogs from Sweeney Ridge and is therefore not a "balance" between recreation and protection of natural resources at this site which is not highly used by the public and does not have issues with dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2079

Organization: self - the program will not allow unchecking the boxes

Comment ID: 200531

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: "The Preferred Alternative is not "balanced."The 1979 Pet Policy allowed dogs off-leash on less than 1% of GGNRA land. Given recent additions of large tracts in San Mateo County to the GGNRA, this number is now significantly less than 1%. Off-leash dog walking started from a position of great imbalance. One-third of San Francisco households have dogs, yet they can currently recreate with their dogs on less than 1% of GGNRA land. The Preferred Alternative allows off-leash on even less, including no off-leash anywhere on GGNRA land in San Mateo County. How is that balanced? By denying the possibility of off-leash on any new lands that come into the GGNRA in the future, the Preferred Alternative will ensure there is no balance between recreation and protection of natural resources in the future. We need more off-leash recreational open space, not less."

Concern ID:

29363

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative because it bans dogs from Sweeney Ridge which seems excessive, especially because certain access points to the site are paved trails or roads that allow bikes, horses, and truck traffic.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1741

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 191206

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a Pacifica resident who walks her dog primarily @ Sweeny Ridge. I am unhappy w/ GGNRA preferred alternative which will BAN all dog walking - even on-leash - at Sweeny.

The access from San Bruno is a paved trail with foot-bike-horse-dog and vehicle traffic- seems unfair that those uses will continue but I won't be able to walk my dog.

Please consider ALT E for Sweeny with the addition of the Baquiano Trl to continue on-leash do walking at Sweeny.

Corr. ID: 2244

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 200918

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I object to all currently proposed (new) restrictions prohibiting off-leash dog running at Fort Funston and all GGNRA properties within the Pacifica city limits. There are already too few areas in the San Francisco Peninsula where off-leash dog use is allowed, and the new restrictions under consideration are far too excessive.

At Fort Funston, the largest area proposed for off-leash use is on the beach, which is simply the least accessible area to use given high tides and poor weather conditions.

Corr. ID: 2784

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 201134

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Points I want to make in regards to Sweeney Ridge.

1. The trails leading up to the nike site from Sneath at Sweeney ridge are paved and have daily truck traffic to service the water towers and antenna. I would imagine the environmental impact of the trucks would severely outweigh the small amount

of k9 traffic.

2. The trails are very steep and there is no way for dogs to go off of the pavement.
3. The Sneath side of the park is very low foot traffic which is mostly locals, many of which use the park to walk their dogs.
4. The majority of the paved lands at Sweeney ridge are owned by the water company, and are excluded from the GGNRA boundary map. What effect will this have on leash requirements.

What I want.

Ideally for the current leash required laws at Sweeney Ridge to remain unchanged. Failing that, at least allow leashed dogs on the portion of the park that is paved.

Corr. ID: 2895

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202964

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I frequently visit the Sweeney Ridge Trail within the Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill Area and strongly encourage No action or Alternative E. I find the preferred alternative unacceptable and it would eliminate my ability to use the area. I thought the need for open recreational space would surely be more important than closing the whole area because of occasional dog leash violators. I truly enjoy Sweeney Ridge Trail and eliminating my access to myself and my dog violates the very principal of your mission. If preserving the natural resources of the area is the top priority, then perhaps no one should have access.

Your preferred alternative is too extreme and would only server the purpose of a very small minority. This trail is a paved road that has been ripped into the hill, the vegetation has been highly altered around it. A couple of leashed dogs a day is the least of it's challenges.

Corr. ID: 3708

Organization: Yosemite Conservancy, Sierra Club

Comment ID: 202248

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: First, in Yosemite National Park dogs are allowed on all campgrounds, paved roads, paved bicycle paths, and sidewalks. That means you can walk your dog on leash on bicycle paths or roads to Mirror Lake and over 4 miles in the valley floor. Dogs are also allowed on-leash on the one way 4 mile Old Big Oak Flat Road from Hodgdon Meadow to Tuolumne Grove. I did part of this hike with my dog in 2010 and 2011. This road is in the middle of the wilderness. I am going into so much detail regarding Yosemite National Park dog regulations to show you that your new draft plan is more restrictive than Yosemite National Park.

Specifically, at present, dogs are allowed on leash at the Sweeney Ridge Trail. In the new draft plan this will be prohibited. The first 1.8 miles is a paved road. It then divides and continues one way as a paved road and the other way a dirt road. I have hiked this trail with a leashed dog for over 6 years. The area is used by many locals as a pleasant daily walk with their dogs. Recently I talked to everyone with a dog on that trail and most people had no idea that their dog walking activity would be prevented.

I have also hiked the Miwok-Wolf Ridge trail quite a lot. There are so few trails one can take a dog on-leash that to prohibit dogs on Sweeney Ridge and Miwok-Wolf Ridge would be very sad.

I love the off-leash activity at Ft Funston. To get to the beach at Ft. Funston is an ordeal and most people without a dog go someplace else where they can drive right up to the beach.

I didn't see any horse restrictions in the GGNRA draft plan. Horses create much

more erosion and the owners do not pick up after them.

Finally, I do agree with your plan to close the East Beach to dogs at Crissy Field. The beach at Crissy Field is very convenient and has become over populated with dogs and dog walkers. I do believe parents and children should have a place to go without dogs.

Concern ID: 29364

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The Preferred Alternative is opposed because it bans dogs from Sweeney Ridge without good reason and without sound science regarding impacts from dogs at this site.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 941 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191456 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Likewise why is the Upper Mori Trail now forbidden? And the heavily impacted Sweeney Ridge, entirely off limits to leashed dogs with no good reason.

Corr. ID: 2271 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201054 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I hope you reconsider your ban on dogs in certain areas of your parklands especially Sweeney Ridge and Mori Point in Pacifica. I fail to see how well behaved dogs on or off leash make such a negative impact when I see the mess humans can make; for example, a soiled baby diaper in some bushes on Sweeney Ridge

Corr. ID: 3943 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205957 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I also take issue with the limitation on areas where dogs are currently allowed but may no longer be able to go, such as Sweeney Ridge. Frankly, there seems little support for the proposition that an on-leash dog on a hiking trail would somehow cause more damage than the far more common humans using the same trail.

Corr. ID: 4182 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208768 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I must also add that in the twenty years that I've been climbing the ridge (with dogs), the trail and fire road has not degraded in the least, in fact, as an intimately familiar, close observer of the trail, I must say that it has improved over time. Honestly, I was rather shocked (and extremely disappointed) to see Sweeney Ridge on the list. Clearly having dogs on the trail has had virtually no impact on the environment. In fact, the trail couldn't be a more perfect opportunity to walk dogs in nature and have almost no impact, as the great majority of the trail is paved road.

Please reconsider your pending restrictions on dogs on Sweeney Ridge.

Concern ID: 29365

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The Preferred Alternative is opposed because it bans dogs from Sweeney Ridge which would not allow dog walkers to access the best views of the site and would therefore detract from their visitor experience.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 745 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 185413 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: re: Sweeney Ridge
As the environmental impact on continuing to allow dogs would be minor to moderate, please support option A - no change to this area. There are very few scenic hikes in San Mateo County that my family can take with our dog - PLEASE

DO NOT BAN DOGS FROM SWEENEY RIDGE!

Corr. ID: 1131 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192445 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have enjoyed using GGNRA sites at Sweeny Ridge, Milagra Ridge, and Mori Pointfor the past two decades. I would be deeply saddened to see adoption of any sort of "no dogs" policy in these areas (as at least a few of the "B, C, and D" alternatives propose).

CS1300 - Cattle/Sweeney: *Desire Other Alternative*

Concern ID: 29367

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support Alternative A because on-leash dog walking is allowed at Sweeney Ridge; some reasoning includes the lack of sound science regarding impacts from dogs and the infrequent use of this site

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 35 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 184005 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Specifically I would like to see Sweeny Ridge, San Pedro Point and Rancho Tierra Maintain current policy towards dogs on leash.

Corr. ID: 2295 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226682 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a Pacifica resident who has been using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System for over 3 years. I typically hike and run the trails 4 days a week with my dog on-leash (6 feet in length) between the Mori Ridge trailhead and Portola Discovery Site or SFPUC Portola Gate. I have also used the trail system for regular hiking with my family without dogs as well as mountain biking. I am fully in support of continued multi use of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System for all uses including dog walking (leash only), hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I am opposed to GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Preferred Alternative, which would ban on-leash dog walking on the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. My preference would be for Plan adoption of Alternative A (Map 19-A), which would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge Trail System with the exception of the Notch Trail, which would allow hiking only.

Corr. ID: 4118 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208518 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: SWEENEY RIDGE - I support Alternative A, No Action (in harmony with 1979 Pet Policy). This area is relatively infrequently used. Even if usage were to increase, it does not require a change in Policy.

Corr. ID: 4598 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210069 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: After much consideration, I support Alternative A, the No Action alternative and would also include the Newly-acquired areas (such as Cattle Hill, Sweeny Ridge, Mori Point, Pedro Point and Milagra Ridge and Rancho Corral de Tierra) in San Mateo County.

The DEIS shows a bias against the No Action alternative or variations on that alternative. There are other areas in the GGNRA such as Ocean Beach, where the existing 1979 Pet Policy has been working and where sensitive species are not present and visitor conflicts do not occur or are very infrequent. In addition, the DEIS does not provide site-specific information that these areas are inappropriate for continued dog walking.

Concern ID: 29368

CONCERN

Commenters support either Alternative A or E for Sweeney Ridge because these

STATEMENT: alternatives provide the most on-leash dog walking at the site and therefore meet the need for open recreational space.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1893 **Organization:** University of San Francisco
Comment ID: 200620 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is a severe shortage of open-space where I can walk with my dog in San Mateo County. Loss of this the Sweeney Ridge hiking trails would only exacerbate this problem, and would degrade the quality of life in this county. Needless to say, I prefer Alternative A or Alternative E, which would provide the most access

Concern ID: 29369
CONCERN STATEMENT: There is support for Alternative B because visitors want a no-dog experience at this site and are concerned about impacts to natural resources as a result of dogs.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29335 (MR1100), Comment 203736.

CS1400 - Cattle/Sweeney: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29371
CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA - Commenters suggest that Sweeney Ridge should be open to off-leash dog walking or ROLAs because the site is infrequently used and has significant open space, which would provide a balance between the need for recreation and the protection of natural resources. Suggested ROLAs include the trails/fire roads within Sweeney Ridge.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 841 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 186202 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Sweeney Ridge: like Milagra Ridge, this trail/fire road is virtually devoid of anything more than the occasional person. After traversing the steep up/down of the canyon up to the ridgeline, I have rarely ever seen another person at all. The trail is not for the faint-of-heart, and this generally scares off anyone except the most physical/avid hikers. I'd prefer to see this area completely off-leash and voice control for dogs for those reasons. It is one of the best places to have significant open-space with virtually no other human contact to walk dogs.

Corr. ID: 2026 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 193247 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: San Mateo (I) Comments

So much land. It would be wonderful to have at least one large area where dogs + their humans can play- off leash.

Corr. ID: 2286 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 201162 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2. Sweeney Ridge: You need some off leash trails here. Of the alternatives offered, Alternative A is the best of a poor lot.

Corr. ID: 4606 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 210154 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: it's the responsibility of GGNRA/DEIS to identify and analyze mitigation actions for the adverse impacts they claim. Otherwise they have not truly analyzed Alternative A.

If GGNRA would add to Alternative A reasonable off leash areas in the GGNRA sites in San Mateo County, while mitigating problems they find with Alternative A,

they would have a truly preferred alternative.

Corr. ID: 4623 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208406 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding the proposed GGNRA changes, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is overly restrictive and punitive to responsible dog walkers and their dogs. I would like to see the Park Service revise the dog management plan to formalize the existing GGNRA dog policy (aka the 1979 Pet Policy) plus provide for balanced off-leash areas in San Mateo County and new lands and remove any proposed rules to reduce or ban dog recreation based only on violations.

The GGNRA should develop a new alternative, the A+ Alternative, which will better balance the recreational needs of the Bay Area with protection of natural resources.

Concern ID:

29373

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[On-Leash - On-leash dog walking should be allowed within areas of Sweeney Ridge including the Baquiano Trail and along Sneath Lane to the Nike Missile site.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3059 **Organization:** Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Comment ID: 201237 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Sweeney Ridge, I propose that any paved trail that routinely supports service vehicular traffic allow on-leash dogs. The impact of dogs versus vehicles seems somewhat minute. I wonder what impact vehicular traffic has on surrounding wildlife.

Corr. ID: 3812 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208447 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1. I believe that leashed dogs should be allowed on the paved road at Sweeney Ridge. That is, the road between Sneath Lane and the Nike Missile Site. This would serve the park's goal of keeping the wilder sections of the site dog-free, but allow local residents the opportunity to walk on a portion of the park.

Corr. ID: 4688 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210089 **Organization Type:** State Government

Representative Quote: Sweeney Ridge:

Map 19E should include on-leash access for the Baquiano and Sneath Lane/NPS Easement Trails. We suggest that the thick chaparral on the Baquiano side and the fact that the Sneath Lane/NPS trail is paved would prevent most if not all dogs from accessing the property off the trails (in the event there is non-compliance with the leash law). Proper enforcement of the rules should ensure that few if any violations occur, in which case the environmental effects from site access on this parcel would be minimal.

Concern ID:

31316

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[No Dog Areas - The Meadow Loop Trail should be for hikers only due to proximity to wetland containing red-legged frog and garter snake.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2295 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226683 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: would also support Plan adoption of Alternative A with Modification by also limiting use of the Meadow Loop Trail to hiking only. By providing two trails for hiking only, this would help reduce potential user conflicts while protecting the most sensitive habitats within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. The Notch Trail is a narrow single track trail located within an identified sensitive Mission blue butterfly corridor. The Meadow Loop Trail is also a narrow

single track trail located next to a sensitive fresh water wetland that likely supports California red-legged frog and potentially San Francisco garter snake.

Concern ID:

31317

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Signage - Additional signage should be placed at trailheads explaining visitor user regulations and also any important habitat or wildlife located along the trails.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2295

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226684 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is limited signage at most of the trail heads. For example, there is not much signage at the Mori Ridge Trail entrance and the Portola Discovery Site area (intersection of Sweeney Ridge Trail, Baquiano Trail, and Sneath Lane Trail). There should be additional signage that explains the important rules and regulations applicable to all users similar to the signage installed at the Notch Trail entrance within Skyline College and the Milagra Ridge Trail System entrance. This would significantly help in reducing potential user conflicts by educating trail users and reinforcing the regulations. Please explain why this wasn't considered in the Dog Management Plan for reducing user conflicts.

l) In order to protect the surrounding habitat and make sure trail users stay on the designated trails, there should be additional signage installed at the trail heads explaining w/illustrations the local habitat and wildlife. This signage should be similar to the signage installed at the Notch Trail entrance within Skyline College and the Milagra Ridge Trail System entrance. This would also help educate and reinforce GGNRA regulations. Please explain why this wasn't considered in the Dog Management Plan for reducing potential user conflicts within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

Concern ID:

31574

CONCERN STATEMENT:

There is support for continuing to allow off-leash dog walking at Sweeney Ridge.

For representative quote, please see Concern 29271 (MP1400), Comment 204113.

Concern ID:

31810

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Dogs should be allowed off-leash from Sneath lane to Fassler, on dirt trails south of Sneath, and at Cattle Hill and the road to the Nike missile site. They should also be allowed on-leash from Shell Dance Nursery to the missile site, but should not be allowed on the Notch trail.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4640

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227731 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Sweeney Ridge

Allows balanced areas for dog recreation plus one trail for no dogs even though overall visitation on the "no dog" trail will probably be less because of not allowing dogs. While there is no evidence of dogs impacting the Mission Blue Butterfly, Notch Trail includes the habitat for the butterfly so even remote impacts are eliminated.

-Trails from Sneath Lane entrance to Fassler entrance and dirt trails south of that path (plus Cattle Hill and road to the Nike Missile Site)

-Trail from the Shell Dance Nursery to the Nike Missile Site

-Notch Trail

Note that on the Bay side nearby Sawyer Camp Trail and San Bruno Mountain do not allow any dogs. On the Coast side nearby San Pedro Valley does not allow dogs.

I doubt there is a significant number of visitors that are truly afraid of dogs that will visit Sweeney Ridge because of the large, wild predators in the park

DC1000 - Duplicate comment

There were no comments on DC1000

ED1000 - Editorial

There were no comments on ED1000

EJ2010 - Environmental Justice: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 29478

CONCERN STATEMENT: Off-leash dogs present a threat to the elderly since they are easily knocked down. Commenters also feel that minority ethnic groups are disproportionately impacted by off-leash dogs since many minorities are afraid of dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1886 **Organization:** San Francisco State University

Comment ID: 200399 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not even visit Fort Funston because I am aware that it has basically become a dog park. The GGNRA is home to many sensitive, endemic species that need to be protected from off-leash dogs. I also feel that off-leash dogs present a threat to the elderly, who are in danger of being knocked down by uncontrolled dogs.

There is also evidence in a report by Dr. Nina Roberts to suggest that minority ethnic groups are disproportionately impacted by off-leash dogs as they are afraid of the dogs.

I strongly urge you NOT to allow off-leash dogs in the GGNRA, accept perhaps in fenced-in designated "dog park" areas.

Corr. ID: 4631 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208667 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a person from the country of Myanmar and I have moved to the US to study at San Francisco State University as a scientist I study birds. I go to Chrissy Field, Tomales bay and Fort Cronkhite to look at the seabirds and other birds. There are dogs there that scare the birds by running after them. I am also nervous at these places because I am also afraid of dogs. We do not have many dogs in my country and they frighten me. I hope you will protect the birds.

Concern ID: 29479

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters disagree with statements made in the plan from the 2007 San Francisco Study about how Latinos and Asians feel towards off-leash dogs. The plan should look at additional studies that focus on minorities that visit GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4533 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209693 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Plan/DEIS suggests that minorities don't visit the park or don't fully enjoy the park because of the presence of dogs, and that seniors, the handicapped and families with small children are threatened and intimidated by the presence of dogs. These suggestions are based on "studies" and "telephone surveys." The reality, however, is that many of the people with dogs in the GGNRA

represent and include minority groups, seniors, the handicapped and families with small children. In particular, I often see families with young children and their dog playing and picnicking at the East Beach area of Crissy Field. The preferred alternatives in many of the sites would have a more negative impact on many in those groups as the restrictions to access with dogs would make recreation that much more difficult or impossible. For instance, if a family with small children or a person with a walker has to walk to the Central Beach at Crissy Field before allowing their dog off-leash, many of those people will not be able to enjoy a beach experience with their dog because they will not have access.

Corr. ID: 4634 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208678 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The claim that "environmental justice" requires severe restrictions on offleash dogs is not supported by the studies cited in the DEIS. A DEIS cited 2007 San Francisco State study claims that all Latinos and Asians surveyed said that dogs were a problem. However, the study was not about the "ethnic minority visitor use experience at the GGNRA" as claimed in the DEIS, but was actually intended to address ways to improve connecting people to the parks. In any event, the SF State study involved only 100 people who were largely unfamiliar with the GGNRA. My own observation is that people of all ethnic and national origin backgrounds and their dogs enjoy offleash experiences at Crissy Field which the proposed changes will deny to them.

Corr. ID: 4684 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209958 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If the Park User Experience section of the Draft Plan must include racial data, it must first collect that data, give a thorough analysis before making the generalization that minorities such as Asians and Latinos are afraid of dogs. I find this section of the Draft Plan deficient of data concerning park use by race.

EJ4000 - Environmental Justice: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives

Concern ID: 29480

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Restricting off-leash dog walking limits equal access for the disabled, elderly, lower income, and ethnic minority communities. For example - the elderly and disabled will have a difficult time reaching the ROLA at Fort Funston under the preferred alternative. These minority groups prefer off-leash dog walking since it allows them to not have to exert physical strength which they may not have. In addition, these minority groups will be disadvantaged since some of them will have to travel further to reach off-leash areas. Some low income individuals may not have a car to drive to alternative off-leash dog walking sites. Restricting dog walking activities will impact this type of recreation that minority communities enjoy.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3941 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205932 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is unfair to punish all responsible dog owners with such severe measures for the problems created by a few dog owners. For example, we do not see similar severe measures being taken against bicyclists for the actions of a few.

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.

Concern ID: 29481
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters believe that the preferred alternatives in the plan will negatively affect the local economy including many small businesses. Professional dog walkers will be forced to raise their fees, which may be unaffordable by some middle class dog owners. Some professional dog walkers may go out of business. Some small businesses that are located near areas that plan to eliminate off-leash dog walking or ban dogs will lose the business from dog owners that will go elsewhere to walk their dog. The plan does not account for the economic benefit of having dog-friendly areas which attract tourists.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1547 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 190740 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: This unique National Recreation area is just that: a recreation area meant to be preserved for recreation, established to preserve the beauty of coastal living for all to enjoy even as the urban areas become more densely populated and suburbs stretch at the seams of growth limits. For every action, there is a reaction and the severe curtailing of the use these lands were designed for, will no doubt stress other open areas and parks, leading to other conflicts among groups of users. Plus many hundreds of small businesses that include pet walking would be affected-and I think it's a safe bet that those business owners are among the most conscientious users of the GGNRA lands because their very jobs depend upon the fact that they observe the rules and avoid tickets.
Corr. ID: 1566 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 190771 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Like everyone in a free country, dog walkers have a right to make a living. If you limit them to 3 dogs a t a time, they will have to raise their fee in order to make a living. Then many middle class dog owners cannot afford a walker.

EJ5000 - Environmental Justice: Cumulative Impacts

There were no comments on EJ5000

FB1100 - Fort Baker: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29549
CONCERN STATEMENT: The Preferred Alternative is supported because it allows on-leash dogs on the parade grounds, Drown Fire Road, and East Road. Commenters support this alternative for personal health reasons and for the well being of dogs.

For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29237 (OV1300), Comment 181777 and Concern 29296 (HV1300), Comment 203418
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 10 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181422 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: the following are my comments on some of the various areas under review.

Fort Baker: Alt A or Alt C.
Corr. ID: 3934 **Organization:** 3rd Supervisorial District of the County of Marin
Comment ID: 205859 **Organization Type:** County Government
Representative Quote: Fort Baker: Please consider including the Parade Grounds, Drowns Fire Road and East Road for dogs on leash.

FB1200 - Fort Baker: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29550

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters oppose the preferred alternative since it would prohibit off-leash dog walking on the few remaining trails in the area.

For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29294 (HV1200), Comment 182084

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 646 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181439 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I oppose the proposed dog restrictions in Marin County. The Audubon Society does not represent the interests of most resident taxpayers and it certainly doesn't represent our country's pet owners.

FB1300 - Fort Baker: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29551

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative D because it is most protective of natural resources and visitor safety.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1472 **Organization:** Marin Audubon
Comment ID: 200253 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative D: Muir Beach, Fort Baker, Homestead Valley, Alta Trail and Orchard and Pacheco Fire Roads, Oakwood Valley, Marin Headlands Trail

FB1400 - Fort Baker: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29553

CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA - In order to provide more balance between user groups, a ROLA should be added to the mowed lawn on the Parade Ground.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2038 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193277 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It would appear that all alternatives were NOT considered. There are areas which would qualify as appropriate ROLA areas (ie no endangered species present) which have not been marked as ROLAs. For example, the mowed lawn on the Parade Ground of Fort Baker (which is entirely encircled by roadway. Why NOT add a ROLA here to preserve balance between dog-owners + non-dog owners in the GGNRA?

Concern ID: 29554

CONCERN STATEMENT: No Dog Area - Dog walking should be prohibited on Battery Yates Loop or Drown Fire Road in order to protect Mission blue butterfly habitat.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Comment ID: 208895 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Fort Baker - We generally support the Preferred Alternative, with the exception of Battery Yates Loop and Drown Fire Road. We believe the primary focus of this area should be protection of the mission blue

butterfly habitat and that this area be off limits to recreation with dogs. .

FF1100 - Fort Funston: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29409

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support Alternative C as the Preferred Alternative at Fort Funston because it will allow the site to be used by everyone; it presents a balances use and compromise of the site by allowing on-leash areas, off-leash areas, and no-dog areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 961 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191594 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support adopting the new dog plan, which will allow Fort Funston to be shared, once again, by families, by children, by the elderly... by people of every kind.

Corr. ID: 2701 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195549 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I write in general support of your proposals. I believe they strike a fair balance among the competing needs of dog owners, non-dog owning visitors, and the environment. Since I live in the City and primarily use those parts of the park in the City, my focus has been on them and I think they are fair and reasonable. Fort Funston is a good example; the current situation has made it so that I do not much enjoy visiting it anymore, since I am routinely being run down by off leash dogs, being hit by tennis balls thrown by owners, stepping on dog waste, and so forth. By combining an off leash area with on-leash and prohibited areas, there is room for all to enjoy.

Corr. ID: 3741 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204591 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel there needs to be a better balance of human recreation vs protection of natural resources. For this reason, I urge you to go with the preferred alternative, particularly as it applies to Fort Funston.

While I don't trivialize the importance of dog walking as a form of recreation, I don't feel it should be allowed at the expense of native habitat for wild animals and the ecosystem that supports them.

Concern ID: 29410

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it will allow visitors who do not enjoy dogs to have a no-dog (or more controlled dog) visitor experience at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1445 **Organization:** Self

Comment ID: 199679 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One of your proposals I strongly support and that is to control dog walkers. They bring 5 to 10 loosely managed dogs to Fort Funston. While some of the more responsible ones try to clean up after the dogs. Far too many look the other way.

Corr. ID: 3547 **Organization:** fellow feathers HG club

Comment ID: 201305 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a regular walker at Fort Funston and support Alternative 'C'.

Some of the dogs are very scary and should not be off leash all over the Park. The dogs impact my walking . They scare me when they run at me.

Concern ID: 29411

CONCERN STATEMENT: There is support for the Preferred Alternative because it limits/restricts off-leash dogs at Fort Funston, which will preserve the natural resources and/or wildlife at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2305 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200614 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs have destroyed Fort Funston's highlands in the last 15 years, and I have seen numerous people and animals terrorized by badly behaved off-leash dogs. Irresponsible dog owners are ruining the parks and city for everyone and reasonable limits need to be enforced. The GGNRA is right and the Supes, as usual, are just pandering.

Corr. ID: 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates

Comment ID: 209124 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: FORT FUNSTON. Alternative C should be adopted to protect nesting bank swallows.

Concern ID: 29412

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it limits/restricts off-leash dogs at Fort Funston and will therefore reduce conflicts associated with dogs (between other dogs, horses, or humans) at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1466 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199815 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing in support of the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement. I ride horses out at Fort Funston and access the trails, beach and Fort Funston three times a week. I grew up in San Francisco and walked our family dogs at Fort Funston in the 80s and 90s. The change in the habitat there is depressing. Seeing dogs harass the dwindling bird life is very sad; watching people not pick up after their dog is enough to make me go nuts. The lack of cooperation and understanding of shared open space has been a source of great frustration for me. Over the last ten years, I have witnessed three accidents involving dogs and horses. One involved the rider being hospitalized. One involved the death of the dog. For these reasons, I am firmly in support of all that the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan is attempting to do. I feel that Alternate C is a compromise for everyone but is much better than the status quo. I firmly support ongoing dialogue and clearer policy.

Corr. ID: 3511 **Organization:** Fellow Feathers

Comment ID: 201256 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a regular visitor of Fort Funston, I support Alternative C dog leash plan.

The recent attack (and resultant death) of a dog by two pit bulls should be a moment of reflection, though, for stricter leash laws.

Thank you for taking some action, however, in addressing the dog leash issue at Funston.

Corr. ID: 3632 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204110 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to support the preferred alternative as presented in the DEIS. Although I have some reservations about all elements of the plan, I believe that it is basically sound and should be supported. I have two dogs

and have had several negative experiences while walking my dogs on GGNRA lands. One time, at Fort Funston, one of my dogs was chased in a very aggressive manner by a pit bull and eventually was bitten by this same animal. All this occurred while the owner of the other dog watched from afar as I tried to break them up. The bite drew blood but otherwise didn't hurt my dog badly. This is one example among many of where there was inadequate control by dog owners over their pets. One other time worth mentioning happened when I took my son to Fort Funston when he was 4 years old. A commercial dog walker was unable to control an animal that lunged at my son to get the stuffed toy in my son's hand. The large dog slammed into my son and caused him to hit his head on the course asphalt pavement. I called the park police and reported this incident at the time. My son has suffered permanent disfigurement to the forehead from this fall. In short, I think the NPS needs to put a rule in place that curtails the seemingly out-of-control offleash dog access in some parts of GGNRA to restore a modicum of safe recreational access for all park users. I think this DEIS is going in the right direction, though some relaxation of "no dogs" could occur in some parts of GGNRA lands in Pacifica with no detrimental effect to the natural environment, including listed species habitats. For example, the Baquiano Trail and the Sneath Lane access trail from the parking lot to the Baquiano Trail could be allowed for onleash access.

Finally, I support a carefully analyzed and implemented compliance strategy to ensure full compliance with all rules related to dog management. Things are far too lax now and must be brought under control. The basic elements of such an approach are in the plan, but actual implementation is not ensured by simply writing a plan. There must be coordinated follow through with the affected cities and neighborhoods, good signs, and then enforcement.

Concern ID:

29413

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it will limit either the number of dogs per walker at Fort Funston or will limit the number of dogs a commercial dog walker is allowed, which should reduce the dog damages/impacts at the site.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3136

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 203717

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please adopt option C (the NPS Preferred Alternative) for the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. I am a regular supporter of the Golden Gate Parks Conservancy and a frequent and long-time (over 10 years) volunteer.

The first is the limit on numbers of dogs that can be walked by an individual, and the numbers that can be walked off leash.

My many days spent at Ft. Funston have left me convinced that the majority of damage done by dogs is done by the large packs with a single walker or two. Many of these are professional dog walkers, and their use of the park is frankly exploitive.

The second is the implicit recognition that traffic should be restricted to the trails, as in any park. I think that most people, and even most dogs, recognize this, but many still do not. Educating people on the value of the park, and teaching them to respect it by respecting the trails, is in the long term the only way to protect the park.

I appreciate the work that all parties have put into developing this plan, but please remember that the stakeholders in the park include a large community of flora and fauna. They can't attend meetings and rely on us to represent them.

FF1200 - Fort Funston: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29414

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters are opposed to the Preferred Alternative at Fort Funston because it will limit/restrict the amount of off-leash areas at this site and will therefore cause negative dog reactions (conflicts) as a result of over-crowding at the proposed ROLAs at Fort Funston or at other dog parks.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 6 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181406 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please leave the Presidio and Funston open to off-leash dogs. If you don't, you will simply make the neighborhood parks more crowded with dogs/their walkers.

Corr. ID: 228 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180725 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston and the other parks are already packed full of dogs - restricting the size of off leash play would make it dangerous for small dogs and people protecting them as they would be confined in the same areas that aggressive large dogs also are playing.

Corr. ID: 247 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180814 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: By limiting these areas to off leash, would only crowd exercise areas making the whole exercise plan an impossibility. Dogs would only get in each others path causing potential harm to all dogs.

DO NOT MAKE THE PROPOSED OFF LESH AREAS AT FORT FUNSTON AND CRISSY FIELD LIMITED IN SPACE IN ANY WAY

Corr. ID: 278 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180921 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And on weekends my husband and I include Fort Funston as part of a regular exercise for us with our dog.

The new plan suggests the the area which would allow off leash activity would be limited to a small section near the parking lot and a stretch of beach. There are a few problems with this proposal. I'll start with the section by the parking lot - this would dramatically concentrate more off leash dogs into a smaller area thus leading to dog management. Dogs don't always like to be near other high energy dogs. Mine prefers wide open spaces and not necessarily large groups of dogs and activity. Furthermore, since the area is not fenced it may cause issues with dogs that run into the parking lot where there is traffic thus endangering the dog and drivers. Most people I know walk away from the lot before they unleash their dog but I fear that since they will not be able to go far they'll end up staying closer to the parking lot than is advised. The other issue with the proposed beach-only area for off leash activity is that it puts pressure on people to have to go down to the beach which does not always work. I for example don't often go to the beach because my dog will get wet. Some people worry that their dogs will get swept up in the waves or tide. Some hunting dogs cannot resist rolling in the dead birds, fish or seals that wash up on the beach nearly every day. And above all, the tides sometimes render the beach nearly impossible to use because of how narrow it can be.

Corr. ID: 419 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181601 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I OPPOSE the Draft Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Plan/DEIS) for Dog Management:

Reducing the off-leash area will make it more difficult for certain sections of the community to use the parks. The elderly, the disabled, and people with children rely on the wide open space for access and safety. Reducing the off-leash area at Fort Funston for example will concentrate dogs in a small area where those with mobility issues will not be able to walk safely.

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192063 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: c) Fort Funston:

The DEIS fails to provide scientific support for the drastic reduction in off leash play areas and fails to take into account the negative effects from the massive reduction in off leash dog play areas. The DEIS should address the following:
i The area designated for off leash play near the parking lot is a small fraction of the former off leash play area. Severe overcrowding will result, with conflicts, damage to overcrowded area, and strong incentives for dog walkers to cheat in leash required areas.

Corr. ID: 2067 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193326 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: At Ft. Funston the Alternative plan would crowd dogs so much as to create tension and unruly behavior. It is the open space for people and dogs that allows for safe and enjoyable intermingling. Dogs need space.

Concern ID:
CONCERN
STATEMENT:

29415
Commenters are opposed to the Preferred Alternative at Fort Funston because it will limit/restrict off-leash areas for dog walking; which is enjoyable to visitors with dogs and provides good quality of life; provides good exercise for dogs and it would be unfair to take these areas away as a result of a few violators because there is no comparable place like Fort Funston in the area.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 448 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181703 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: If we could not have access to this area, it would be very difficult to live in the city where we both work.

Please keep the area of Fort Funston open to dogs and their families, dog walkers and allow the animals to continue to enjoy the outside play off leash.

Corr. ID: 502 **Organization:** known
Comment ID: 181879 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I feel this is unfair to the general public who have enjoyed Fort Funston for over two decades to be able to take their dogs to an authorized No Leash park. I also feel it is UNFAIR to the Professional Dog Walker and their clients who utilize both these services. WHY THE CHANGE NOW?.

Corr. ID: 740 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182692 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am concerned that the changes being proposed will significantly affect the quality of life for both my dog and my family.

The new, proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston seem unnecessarily strict and arbitrary. The plan at this location is confusing and illogical and has the potential to create a lot of unintentional non-compliance because it is so confusing.

Corr. ID: 902

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191264

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We visit Ft. Funston regularly with our Labradoodle and kids, and before kids we brought our Siberian Husky. Many dog breeds need a place to run to get sufficient exercise, especially City dogs. Please don't take this off-leash privelege away from those who love Ft. Funston, and love dogs who can run free.

Corr. ID: 1745

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200233

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to acknowledge my support to continuing the off-leash policy for dogs that currently exists at Fort Funston. Fort Funston is unique in that it allows dogs the chance to run and roam freely. With no place else like it within many miles of San Francisco, dog owners will be denied the opportunity to exercise their dogs in a place that has successfully been used for this purpose for many years. Denying San Franciscans and their dogs this liberty strikes me as more punitive than stemming from any real grievance regarding nature's balance at Fort Funston- whatever others might claim.

Corr. ID: 1776

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191574

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My dog and I both have a better quality of life by being able to walk freely at Fort Funston Recreational Center. If the leash laws are enacted, our quality of life would be greatly reduced

Corr. ID: 2107

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193366

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The people that go to Ft. Funston every day are a community. For many of us, our whole social network is made up of people we see and know from Ft. Funston. We will lose our community if you restrict off-leash dog walking. I am losing my human friends if you restrict off-leash dog walking.

Corr. ID: 3493

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203362

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been taking my dogs to Fort Funston for over twenty years. I don't know what I would do without it. Most dogs are noticeably more relaxed when off-leash resulting in very few altercations. As a matter of fact, in all the years I have gone there I have only had two issues with other dogs. Today's dog population that generally live in cities with working "parents" need the freedom to run and play to be healthy, happy animals. Considering the ratio of dogs to people today in San Francisco and the Bay Area, it is even more important that dogs and their owners should have a place like Fort Funston to walk and play regularly. There are plenty of parks where dogs are not allowed that dogless people can visit!!

Concern ID:

29416

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The Preferred Alterntive at Fort Funston is opposed because it presents a danger to or is unsafe for dogs, including the proximity of the upland ROLA to the parking area and cliffs and/or because there would be little safe beach area at high tide at the beach ROLA and dogs would be concentrated in a small area within the ROLA on the beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 393 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181182 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I currently walk my dog at Ft. Funston -- either on the beach or along the trails. As proposed, the trails would be off limits to off-leash dogs. When tides are high, there would be no safe place for leash-free exercise.
Corr. ID: 3995 **Organization:** The Hearing Dog Program
Comment ID: 207467 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In the proposed option for Fort Funston the trails would be closed to off leash dogs. This would lead to a higher number of off leash dogs concentrated in the ice plant area close to the parking lots. Currently dogs start off here but quickly move on into Fort Funston. With the new plan they would tend to stay in this area. This concentration of dogs would create problems due to the increase in dog density. It would also become less safe due to proximity to moving cars.

I proposed that you keep Fort Funston as it has been for several decades. It has proven to be an ideal example of how large numbers of people and dogs can recreate in an enjoyable and safe manner. It is a shining example of how an off leash recreational area can meet the recreational needs of people with and without dogs. You have a real jewel to point to that's unique in the world. Please don't destroy it through closing portions of Fort Funston to off leash dogs

Corr. ID: 4412 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207005 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fort Funston

PAVED ROADS: Dogs do not cause damage to pavement
Although it is understandable for the park service to want to keep dogs out of a portion of the dunes, allowing dogs off leash on the paved roadways does not result in environmental damage. From my observation of people walking dogs in Ft. Funston, 99% of dogs and owners stay on the paved roadway.

PROPOSED ROLA AREA: Keep dogs away from cars
The plan shows the proposed ROLA to be next to the parking lot. It makes no sense for dogs to be off leash in close proximity to cars, and on leash when they are away from them. The decision to limit the ROLA. to this area is absurd!

Corr. ID: 4612 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 206344 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I have trouble with the GGNRA's preferred alternative plan in that it severely limits and affects the off leash dog walking area at Fort Funston. From the maps I have seen, the preferred alternative. off leash area is bound by the large and always busy parking lot, steep cliffs and one paved walkway and one sanded path. I am concerned that if the number of dogs allowed playing off leash in that area dramatically increases, the cliffs and the parking lot become major safety concerns. Additionally, limiting off-leash access to the beach

tative Quote: At Stinson Beach Alternative A allows only for dogs on-leash in the parking areas. This is the best alternative presented, but there should be another alternative that allows dogs off leash on
Corr. ID: 4622 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207049 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The DEIS does not include any discussion of the safety concerns of having children at Fort Funston due to the irregular/remote/hilly

topography, the very dangerous cliff area (constantly eroding from wind and rain and often not visible due to fog) and the dangerous beach.

The "preferred alternative" will create a dangerous situation for humans and dogs by limiting off leash to the area immediately adjacent to the north side of the parking lot. This area is far too small to accommodate the large number of daily walkers and dogs which will result in injury. There is no information in the DEIS as to how this specific amount of Fort Funston was allocated for off leash in the "preferred alternative". No data in the DEIS supports this allocation of limited space to off leash activities (beach off leash discussed below). Without supporting statistical and verifiable data, the basis of this allocation appears to be arbitrary.

Corr. ID: 4643 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208857 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One of my favorite areas to walk the dogs - of which I take only six or seven at a time - would be Fort Funston. This is one of the few areas in which the dogs are now allowed to run and play off leash, but with the new ruling, the area allowed for dogs to play off leash is around the parking lot. Is that what the GGNRA really considers to be a safe area for dogs? With all of the cars coming into the parking lot, the risk of bodily injury to dogs (and people) would be much higher. Fort Funston is wild and full of sand dunes. What possible harm could dogs do to that area? I know that some objections have been made stating that certain bird life may be threatened, of which there is not sufficient data.

Concern ID:

29417

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative because they feel that dogs are not causing disturbance or issues at Fort Funston when compared to horses, people, or natural causes such as wind/weather. Disturbance includes impacting the habitat, affecting wildlife or listed species, and/or because the area is not pristine due to its military history.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 330 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181094 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a regular visitor to Fort Funston I oppose to the proposal changing the dog laws of the GGNRA and absolutely support alternative A. I understand the concern for environmental protection of our planet but disagree that the current laws would do as much environmental damage as proposed. I very rarely see dogs in the protected areas of Fort Funston. Dog owners I have seen have respect for the protected areas of the park. As for wildlife, I have never seen a dog chase or harass any native wild life on the beach at Fort Funston (or Ocean Beach).

Corr. ID: 1203 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194832 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Health of the Environment: Bringing (of all things) more horses onto the trails of Fort Funston, brings with it a population with a horrific sense of entitlement - and no sense of responsibility. The regular dog walkers of Ft Funston clean up after their animals not only on a daily basis but also on a monthly clean-up. Those who bring their horses up to Ft Funston 1) do not stay on the horse trails, 2) frequently do not know how to ride a horse, and have little control of their animals, 3) never clean up after their horses, and 4) leave trails more heavily eroded, more covered with manure, vermin and flies. Turning our trails into 'Horse Trails' makes both the official trails and the adjacent areas unfit, unsafe, and unsanitary for human walkers (with or without dogs). The horse riders have been by far the most inconsiderate and destructive population at Ft Funston.

Corr. ID: 1503

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191362

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly oppose the restrictions on off-leash dog walking recommended in the Preferred Alternative for Fort Funston.

The DEIS report fails to provide any hard data that dogs "degrade" the land. (DEIS, p. xii, p.225) The document fails to consider the extent of human recreational influences on the soil, and to what degree human non-dog activities and occurrences of nature "degrade" the soil.

Corr. ID: 1612

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190854

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Re: Fort Funston

Map 16-A largely preserves the 1979 Pet Policy and should be permanently adopted.

In the 15 years that NPS has been trying to limit off-lease dogs at Fort Funston, we dog owners have abided by the seasonal closures and illegal fencing of other areas. Since Judge Alsop's decision voiding your attempt to change the 1979 Pet Policy, the only changes to Fort Funston have been caused by Mother Nature. The "Habitat Protection Area" is now a huge sand dune, the cliffs above the "season closure" have eroded because of wind and the sea - the same seas that destroyed part of the Great Highway.

Corr. ID: 1717

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191163

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston:

I prefer alternative A because I believe it is already a restricted areas. Fort Funston is a wonderful, iconic place, a place in which we take complete pride. 99% of the folks who go here stay on trail with their dogs, pick up poop and have good voice control.

Corr. ID: 2234

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200863

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support continuance of the current conditions at Fort Funston. I think it is hard to argue that dogs have a more negative impact on the environment than do hanggliders, people drinking at the park after hours (as evidenced by broken bottles in and around the parking lot) and horses. Specific to the last point, the amount of visible dog feces on the beach pales in comparison to the amount of horse feces on any given weekend. I would also imagine that Horse trails in an among the bluffs contribute far more to shoreline erosion than any combined dog use.

Corr. ID: 3066

Organization: SFDog

Comment ID: 201251

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed plan that restricts off-leash dogs on the Chip Trail at Fort Funston does not make any sense as this area is not near the area where the bank swallows nest. If the bank swallow is the basis for restricting dogs in that area, then more attention needs to be paid to the deficits in the DEIS as it does not address the fact that a GGNRA study by researcher Nola Chow has been ignored. Her study showed that that dogs do not disturb the bank swallows.

Corr. ID: 3083

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203076

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have heard your staff say that they think Fort Funston has been destroyed from the dogs. If you walk around Fort Funston, you can see that it is the wind, sand and weather that has changed the landscape - NOT the dogs. I would like to see the Ocean Beach from Sloat to Lincoln to be leash free also. I don't believe that dogs pose a problem for them at all.

Corr. ID: 3546

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203405

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm writing to urge you to vote against the GGNRA's dog management plan, specifically to preserve Fort Funston as a haven for San Francisco dogs. The issue of balancing human use and environmental concern in urban parks is a complex one, but considering the massive demand for and wild success of parks like Fort Funston, the environmental detriment is relatively insignificant.

Fort Funston is a shining example of a functional urban park, in large part due its use by dogs and dog walkers. Advocates of the proposal would paint Fort Funston as a little swath of the Old West, ruled by anarchy, inaccessible to anyone but dog walkers. While the Chronicle had its eye on this issue, the Letters to the Editor section was rife with anecdotes of dog-related irritations and safety concerns from parents of young children. Yes, there have been dogfights and human conflict, as is to be expected in so heavily used an area, but Fort Funston is actually remarkably safe because of the presence of dogs, which diminishes the safety concerns so prevalent in other urban parks. Drug abusers, muggers, pedophiles, homeless encampments and other issues which pose a safety risk to demographics like children, the disabled, the elderly and women alone are massively deterred by the flocks of romping dogs. In my years visiting Fort Funston as a child and teenage girl, I've never had the sort of frightening or uncomfortable encounter I might have at, say, Golden Gate Park.

The sense of security, the geniality of the dedicated dog owners who frequent the park, and the network of wide paved trails make the park a great place for anyone who can stand the company of dogs to visit. Whether you come to tire your dog out among the dunes or to enjoy the spectacular view of the ocean, Fort Funston has never been anything but peaceful and joyous.

On the other side of the equation is the desire to restore as much land as possible to its natural, original state. Those who advocate the plan for this reason don't often mention that Fort Funston is hardly a virgin wilderness. It's a military base--paved over, tunnelled out and seeded densely with invasive iceplant. Considering how oft-used and human-appropriated the land is, one might as well attempt to restore a children's playground or a high school football field to its natural state. As long as there must be some land in the city to meet dog owners' needs--and there must--Fort Funston is absolutely ideal.

Corr. ID: 3670

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204176

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My biggest argument is that NPS doesn't have a good enough reason to change anything. Where dogs are allowed now, they should be allowed always.

These lands have been open to dogs for decades. NPS owes something to the people and dog owners who are and have always been the Parks' biggest customers. We're not talking about allowing dogs where they haven't been allowed before. These are places where dogs have been allowed for a long time. The wildlife is doing just fine with Park visitors who bring their dogs along. We see all kinds of wildlife at Fort Funston everyday. There's ravens, hawks and even an owl

on occasion. If dogs were a problem for the wildlife, then the wildlife wouldn't be there, it would have left a long time ago.

The wildlife in these Parks is thriving on its own without interference-even though there are lots of dogs around. In addition, it's impossible for dogs to disturb cliff dwelling birds. So how can NPS say that the dogs are disturbing the wildlife?

Yet NPS claims that dogs cause erosion as well. Nevertheless, the imperceptible erosion caused by dogs cannot compare to the erosion caused by the wind most every day along the coast. The weather and winter storms cause more erosion than the dogs can possibly do. The wind literally extends beaches across The Great Highway, forcing the closure of the highway a few times a year. Fort Funston in particular is used by hundreds or maybe a thousand people, mostly with dogs every day. When the wildlife is thriving and the erosion is imperceptible with dogs, then what reason does NPS have to kick the dogs out? We're not trying to develop it, change it, or make it into something it isn't - that's what NPS would like to do. The land is not just Parks, it's also part of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. Dog owners and Parks are not in conflict about opening to dogs a pristine land that never saw a human footprint. The land has already been set aside for Recreational use, and dogs are a part of that use, as much as running, hang-gliding, exercising, school sports-team training, and just plain walking.

Corr. ID: 3687

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204207

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are many parks and beaches in California that either do not allow any dogs, or do not allow off-leash dogs. People who want to avoid dogs have plenty of choices. But people and dogs who enjoy the off-leash experience have very few options.

Dogs at Fort Funston are not aggressive, are kept under control, and are simply having fun in a natural way. Fort Funston is NOT a pristine natural environment. Before becoming a park, it was a military installation, and since then, it has been open to dogs. Birds which inhabit the cliff areas are not disturbed by the dogs. There is no valid environmental argument for keeping the dogs on-leash in any area of the trails or beach at Fort Funston. Dogs need to run and play, and many people cannot afford huge yards. My dog trainer has told me that small fenced off-leash dog parks promote aggression in dogs, but the same is not true for Fort Funston, because there is room for the dog to run and walk, so they do not feel threatened.

Concern ID:

29418

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters believe that the Preferred Alternative is unfair to professional dog walkers and/or their clients, and will result in an increase in the cost of commercial dog walking.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1447

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199695

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've read through the proposal; it is hard to follow, but it seems to restrict off-leash areas significantly. We regularly visit Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Fields. While I understand there could be some environmental impact, if dog owners are responsible, it should be minimal. In all my times to 'off-leash' areas, I've never witnesses any issues. Also, I am not a dog walker, but am a small business owner. I have a large dog who requires lots of running for exercise, which would be impossible on leash. Reading the restrictions of off-leash areas as well as the restrictions placed on dog-walking, I see an immediate negative economic impact. Dog Walkers are needed in San Francisco. Dog walking rates are significant and with the proposed restriction, you would see a

significant increase in prices and also a decrease of dog walkers (or they will go out of business). Please keep the off-leash areas available!

Corr. ID: 1914 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192592 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA plan will completely destroy the dog walkers livelihood. This is how we all pay our bills! The limitations imposed will make our jobs impossible, and forcing us to keep all dogs on leash going down that steep hill is completely unsafe and impractical. Please don't do this to us!! Please dont do this to the dogs either. They need a place to play and learn how to be sociable by interacting with other dogs. Impossible on leash!!

Corr. ID: 3188 **Organization:** Professional Dog Walker

Comment ID: 203835 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm a professional dog walker and trainer in San Francisco and I take my pack of 5 - 8 dogs to the horse trails at Fort Funston. I've been going here twice a day for the last 4 years and have trained all of my dogs to respect, at a distance, horses, hikers, and other dogs we may meet on the trails. I take pride in the control I have of my pack of my dogs and have taught my clients how almost every dog has this potential to learn such manners. Those who don't stay on leash until they learn.

We CAN strike a balance between continuing to allow dogs to run naturally and be controlled.

We are not anti-environemntalists, and are, in fact, in favor of preserving the beauty of the natural environment. And we are certainly animal lovers, and to any of us, the thought of our dogs harming other animals or birds is unaccpetable. It is much more often individual dog owners who allow such activities than any dog walkers, in my experience.

Please consider using enforcement for those who do not control their dogs rather than taking away this amazing land from those of us who responsibly enjoy it every day.

Corr. ID: 3747 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204268 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On behalf of my wife and our five year old, neutered male pug, we not only implore you, but we beg you to choose Alternative A (no action) for the San Francisco areas of Crissy Field and Fort Funston. All alternatives suggested other than no action have an adverse effect on my family, my dog, and our dog walker. We are not insensitive or not understanding for the need to propose alternatives that mutually benefit all natural and cultural resources and ensure visitor safety for all that patronize the GGNRA. By proposing alternatives that reduce or eliminate geographical area for monitored dogs to roam restricts the logistics of how to best serve the group of dogs that are taken out for exercise. This in turn may congest the approved areas, reduce the surface area for the dogs to exercise, and ultimately, the dog suffers from an unproductive outing. Further, our dog walker will then be unable to provide the same level of service in the same amount of time. They may have to reduce the number of dogs taken out per outing and raise prices to their customers for the lost scalability. We, as dog owners, would suffer as well by having to pay higher prices and/or suffer from not having our dog being properly exercised.

Unfortunately, after much thought and consideration, none of the alternatives other than no action, keep the same level of benefit for my family, our dog and our dog walker.

We feel the adverse effect of these alternatives, other than no action, simply cannot be condoned.

Concern ID:

29419

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The Preferred Alternative is opposed as a result of accessibility issues, including but not limited to: all the off-leash areas of Alternative C are on sand and hard to navigate for mobility-impaired persons (elderly, handicapped); the on-leash requirement for the Sand Ladder Trail and the steep steps is dangerous to navigate with a leashed dog; the beach ROLA is too hard to access because visitors must walk across/on sand.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 107

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181961

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - requiring folks to leash their dogs on the sand ladder to Fort Funston is quite frankly dangerous. Clearly the writers have not walked up and down that ladder very often. It's very steep and frequently eroded - thus making it a slope. I believe that if dogs were leashed, you'd have quite a few more people taking spills head-first as their dogs eagerly pull them down. If the concern is to keep dogs from romping on the hills, then simply restrict the dogs to inside of the fence.

Corr. ID: 828

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186122

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston

About the "stairs" you want to restrict your park users to. I am an elderly woman with bad hips and a small poodle who needs a good run every day. I work at SF State as a lecturer, so I know how much a public employee needs to love his or her work. But again, the stairs feel to a senior with limited mobility hostile, even sadistic on the part of those who planned them. I took those stairs exactly once, and let me tell you, I had to hit the Aleve bottle heavy afterwards. You are discriminating against the handicapped who need to walk their dogs and want to enjoy nature.

Corr. ID: 887

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190049

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My main issue is that your map if taken at face value could be misconstrued as providing a generous amount of off leash area when in fact the area chosen is problematic in many ways. Primarily, the beach at Ft. Fun is very difficult to access. You either need to walk down/up an extremely steep/sandy/logged path followed by challenging access up/down from the beach. Additionally, after certain bad storms access has been impossible and much garbage has been on the beach as a result of sewer issues and tides. Also, during certain times of the year especially in the summer there are a lot of dead creatures (crabs, birds, sailfin jellie fish, even sea lions) which pose public health issues due to disease and decay. The other beach access point is at least 1/2 mile from the parking lot with another steep (albeit shorter) hill to access. This is going to limit those with any physical issues be it age, cardiac related, musculoskeletal issues etc.

Corr. ID: 984

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191688

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Preferred Alternative the DEIS report recommends for Fort Funston would keep an off leash dog on the sand.

My dog, for physical and health reasons, cannot walk on the sand for long. She has to be on a paved area. You are effectively excluding my dog, and us, her human companions, from recreation activity at Fort Funston by keeping us off the Sunset

Trail.

The report does not address the needs of citizens with physically disabled dogs who have a right to off leash recreation.

The contract with the city of San Francisco in 1979 guarantees that recreational use in this urban park by all its citizens be preserved.

I strongly oppose the harsh restrictions GGNRA recommends in their DEIS report.

Corr. ID: 1173

Organization: The senior exercise club which I just made up

Comment ID: 193547 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to comment and hopefully get you to reconsider the plan. I am a 66 year old senior and walk 40 minutes with my dog at fort funston.

I want you to reconsider the dog area and allow me to walk as I do now...down the paved path with my dog.

Corr. ID: 1185

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193563 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In reviewing all of your proposed plans for Funston, "C" seeming to be that plan to which the GGNRA is leaning, there is an accessibility issue for handicapped individuals and individuals with mobility problems. Proposed Plan C's off lease area is all sand, which is not compact and is sloped on the east side making it impossible for access for handicapped individuals and individuals with mobility problems.

My third point is that making the area at the north water fountain an on leash area would only encourage dogs to be more aggressive when vying for a spot at the water dishes. Dogs are known to be much more defensive and aggressive, when on leash.

Corr. ID: 1205

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194836 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please consider that all but one of your alternate plans for Fort Funston discriminate against seniors walking the trails.

MAP 16: This proposal is the second most restrictive of those proposed. It is punitive to seniors in particular, who cannot navigate easily or regularly up and down the steep cliffs to the designated off-leash area below.

Corr. ID: 1279

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195006 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Preferred Alternative described in the DEIS would exclude me from using Fort Funston in my life-long recreational activity. I believe under the Americans With Disabilities Act, this is illegal.

The recommended off-leash areas described in the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS are not accessible to everyone, especially the mobility-impaired. The document needs to be revised to address and evaluate how the Preferred Alternative will impact mobility-impaired dog owners.

Corr. ID: 1515

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190670 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In the pref alt for Fort Funston I cannot take my on my dog walk for she has a Back disability and would require paved access for both her and the dog. She needs the dog to be off leash for her back condition and cannot handle a dog pulling on the leash. The off leash areas are sand or would require going down a very steep beach access trail which would put great stress to her injury. As

the pref. Alternative would restrict my mom from being able to come to Fort Funston on our dog walks, she will be left out of a very important part of her life. I would like to keep my mom a part of the walk and restricting her I feel is discriminating.

Corr. ID: 1543

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190726

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Re: Fort Funston

Elderly and disabled people will have great difficulty reaching the beach section to allow their dogs to run off-leash. The most important area for them is the top section where the dogs can run around freely.

It is a discrimination against them to force them to walk all the way to the beach area to go off-leash.

Corr. ID: 1563

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190766

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: have used Fort Funston to walk my dogs for over thirty years. My wife and I take our dog there twice a day. The area that will be excluded is paved. There is a dog watering station. 95% of the use I put the facility to will be eliminated. I am a local business owner, House to Home Remodeling. I am 58. Many days my knees will not allow me to walk on loose sand. My doctor says I should walk 1 mile daily. Many of the older and elderly people who walk their dogs at Fort Funston require this exercise for their health. HOW DO you intend to accommodate the disabled, elderly, young parents with strollers, people with canes in your new plan.

Corr. ID: 1567

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190774

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I walk my dog 2x a day at Fort Funston because I have plantar fasciitis, which does not allow me to walk on loose sand or unpaved ground. Funston has a lot of off-leash paved areas currently, where I am able to walk without pain. Over the years, I have observed many elderly and disabled people walking their dogs there because they are able to use their canes and walkers on the paved path, while their dogs can exercise on the sand.

The new restrictions are clearly discriminatory towards disabled people. You propose to confine us to an area that is mostly loose sand.

Corr. ID: 1752

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191220

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The elderly and mobility impaired "people" want equal access with -- ROLA -- it is all about "our joy" of watching and being out in nature w/ your dog and others off leash! Help maintain "less restriction" on the elderly people's access to ROLA for Crissy Field - EAST Beach + Fort Funston. Thank you.

I've heard that some seniors are fearful of off leash dogs jumping on them or knocking them over, that is a small minority. I know a number of senior citizens that go there specifically to interact with people and their dogs, it is the only joy in life they have!! Some seniors need this fresh air, peace of mind, 'socialization' so it is not just dogs that need to keep Fort Funston a ROLA - senior citizens need it too!!!

Corr. ID: 1832

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191966 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: FORT FUNSTON, SAN FRANCISCO GGNRA
Access to be denied the handicapped and aged

We often walk in the early morning, we are respectful of the environment and of one another and we appreciate and depend on the social, recreational and health benefits provided us by the privilege of exercising our dogs and ourselves while walking the loop of the Sunset Trail, coastal Trail and back to the parking lot. Many of us cannot possibly walk on the sand and in the sand dunes. We are puzzled by the severity of the proposals for Ft. Funston. The EIS "Incidents Involving Dogs in 2007 and 2008" table (pg. 130) clearly demonstrates that Ft. Funston is NOT a problem area in terms of closed area violations or disturbing wildlife. Why are we being threatened with punishment (ie; loss of the privilege of walking with our off-leash, voice controlled animals) when we have done nothing wrong?

Corr. ID: 1914 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192591 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no place for handicap people to take their dog at Ft. Fun in preferred alt.

Already fenced off most sensitive habitat at Ft Fun.

Corr. ID: 1926 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192263 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: FoFu- As a senior with a young dog, having ROLA beach access is a safety issue. Make both beach access trails open to off-leash. STUDIES SHOW that the less exercise a dog gets, the fiercer he or she becomes. So let us exercise our dogs properly!

Corr. ID: 1928 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192266 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Do not diminish the joy we all enjoy watching dogs off leash & people running free in our recreation areas! East Beach @ Crissy Field is also much better for the mobility impaired (handicapped) people that want to use the beach, see dogs running.

Corr. ID: 2099 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193343 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Funston

Sand ladder access, and other access , for disabled people with dogs is not adequate.

Corr. ID: 2936 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202228 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing as a Disabled Senior Citizen who uses the public off-leash dog walking areas to exercise my service dog. I am requesting that you continue the current policies regarding dog use at public parks - policies that have provided many otherwise unavailable opportunities for seniors and disabled people to use the beautiful, safe facilities.

Fort Funston provides one of the only opportunity for my service dog to get unleashed exercise. Also, like many other disabled seniors, I am able to enjoy being outdoors in our lovely ocean-side parks and to take advantage of the many social interactions we have while dog walking at Fort Funston. Many of the seniors who,

like me, use Fort Funston several times a week, have found exercise and friendships along with a profound enjoyment of the outdoors and scenery - opportunities we would not have without the current policies.

The professional dog walkers have provided me with much needed assistance on many occasions. For example, when I have been unable to exercise my own dog because I was either hospitalized or unable to leave my own house, the professional dog walkers took care of my dog. On days when I have gone to walk my dog, but had difficulty physically navigating the path, the professional dog walkers were always there to give me a hand. I have observed the professional dog walkers frequently encouraging seniors and providing a hand to older disabled people when needed.

There is absolutely no way any disabled senior could manage the steps down to the beach with a leashed dog. Well, there is no way we could manage the steps without a dog, as the stairs are inaccessible to any of us who have trouble walking. You can take a cane, walker, or wheel chair along the path at Fort Funston, as many of us do, but a walker or wheel chair can not go up and down stairs. I don't know what the ADA requirements are for a public park, but Funston is currently accessible as it is now, and will be completely inaccessible if the plans change as proposed.

Corr. ID: 3052

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201230

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to ask you to please not limit the dog-friendly areas within the GGNRA, especially Fort Funston. Less than 20% of the area is currently available to those of us with dogs, and only 1% available for dogs under voice control. ALL the proposed alternatives, based on very a faulty DEIS, propose limiting them even farther!

I am disabled and therefore unable to exercise my dog on a leash. Fort Funston is just about the ONLY place on the peninsula where my dog and I can get the exercise we need. The paved paths at Fort Funston make it possible for someone like me to walk there.

I can't imagine what it would be like if all those dogs were limited to a much smaller area as proposed in the new guidelines. I would no longer be able to take my dog because I cannot get down to the beach area where they would be allowed and the other area is too small and close to the parking lot.

I do NOT support the draft DEIS for the GGNRA; it doesn't seem to be based on good science or even on good observation. Besides that, Fort Funston was a FORT; there is already huge human environmental impact from it being a fort, and I don't see them talking about removing the concrete bunkers.

Corr. ID: 3088

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201423

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my profound surprise and disappointment with the proposed changes to the Fort Funston recreational area. Both of the access trails to the beach require a high level of fitness and mobility. Because the new plan restricts off leash activities exclusively to the beach, and a small section on the bluff it essentially takes away the opportunity for the elderly or disabled to let their dogs run free. I would also like to point out that there are many times at high tide when there is simply no beach. I also find it curious that part of the reasoning was concern for safety on the cliff, yet the only trail that would remain open to unleashed dogs (the sunset trail) is the very trail where accidents are most likely to occur.

Corr. ID: 4560

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209899

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: For example, the Preferred Alternative would allow off-leash dogs only on the dunes adjacent the parking lot at FF, and on part of the beach. Many elderly and/or mobility impaired individuals cannot make it down the steep access trails to the beach, and thus would be left only with access to that small dune area, which is difficult to navigate, for off-leash recreation. If a person wants to stay close to their off-leash dog (eg, in order to clean up after them), he/she would have to clamber over that difficult-to-navigate terrain, which will be far more crowded with people and dogs, thus increasing the likelihood of being jostled or knocked down.

Corr. ID: 4622

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207078

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Diversity/Discrimination Against Seniors and Disabled-

The DEIS claims under the Environmental Justice section that Hispanic and Asian users of the GGNRA cited dogs as a problem. There is no data in the DEIS for Fort Funston. Obviously the writers of the DEIS are not users of Fort Funston as there is a very diverse population utilizing this property. There are Caucasians, African Americans, Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, etc. all present on a daily basis. In addition to ethnic diversify, Fort Funston users demonstrate a vast array of sex, age and economic levels. Many seniors utilize Fort Funston. Many disabled persons utilize Fort Funston. The "preferred alternative" will be detrimental to seniors and disabled persons who utilize Fort Funston. Many seniors and physically disabled persons who utilize Fort Funston do not want to walk through sand. The off leash areas described the DEIS require the owner to walk though the sand near the parking lot in order to monitor/voice control their pet, or climb down to the beach to access an off leash area. Many senior and disabled persons are unable to make the trek to and from the beach on the sand ladder. The descent to the beach is both arduous and dangerous as the steps are large and uneven. It is easy to lose one's balance. The "preferred alternative" requires that the dog remain leashed while the descent and ascent is made. This is dangerous for both the owner and the animal as any misstep by either can result in very serious injury.

Further many senior or disabled persons want dogs under voice control as it allows them not to have to exert any physical strength with the upper extremities. Many middle aged women suffer from degenerative rotator cuffs which preclude walking a dog on leash. Other disabled or seniors have balance issues. Voice control allows the dog owner to have the availability of both arms to aid in their balance and protect themselves if an accidental stumble should occur. The "preferred alternative" would deprive seniors and disabled persons from the ability to avoid physical injury.

Concern ID:

29420

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Restricting or limiting the off-leash areas under the Preferred Alternative violates the original agreement when Fort Funston was given to GGNRA and this area historically allowed off-leash dog walking, which preserves the urban and recreational uses of GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 807

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186049

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I oppose strongly the proposed changes to off leash dog

activities at Fort Funston and other areas in San Francisco. Off leash dog access should be increased, not restricted. Time and again the courts have ruled against the GGNRA's manipulation of rules requiring off-leash dog activity. Restricting access for off-leash dogs also violates the original agreement when Fort Funston and other lands in San Francisco were given to what is now the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 1129

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192440

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: What the Draft Dog Management Plan fails to do is provide CONTEXT for Fort Funston. This is an URBAN recreational area, not wilderness, and it is surrounded on 3 sides by 2 private golf courses, a gun club and a city sewage treatment plant.

There is no reason to penalize the many lawful dog owners for the errors of the very tiny minority which GGNRA rangers should police.

Corr. ID: 2196

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200693

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have reviewed the GGNRA Draft Dog management plan and I am VERY CONCERNED about much of the plan particularly as it relates to Fort Funston. This park in particular (over Crissy Field and others) is particularly suited to off-leash dog walking. When the City of San Francisco turned the property over to the GGNRA I understand that it was with the plan to maintain it as a dog friendly park. You know the statistics of dogs per people in San Francisco and creating such SEVERE limits to the off-leash dog areas at Fort Funston is a very poor idea which will flood city parks.

Corr. ID: 4621

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207027

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The claim that there are many people who would visit Fort Funston if dogs were not there is not only unsupported by evidence, it is counter-indicated by the other restored dune scrub sites in San Francisco. The Point Lobos Reserve and Parcel 4 (Balboa and Great Highway) have virtually no visitors. It is a myth that there are large numbers of potential visitors who want to look at native plants and dune scrub, but avoid Fort Funston because of the dogs there.

When the ability to take a real walk at Fort Funston with an off leash dog is replaced with the opportunity to watch that dog play in a ROLA, people lose real recreation. GGNRA/DEIS does not seem to realize that it is people's recreation that is at issue. Walking with one's dog is the recreation; watching that dog play in a ROLA is not the same thing at all. GGNRA/DEIS does not acknowledge or evaluate the lost recreation. That is arbitrary and capricious.

GGNRA/DEIS weighs the desire of some people not to see dogs (even though they can continue to hike, picnic, fly kites, ride bikes, watch birds, ride horses, hang glide, etc.) more heavily than the impact on people who will lose outright their recreational activity. This is pure prejudice on the part of GGNRA staff that dog walkers are not legitimate recreational visitors, but all the other visitors are legitimate. This prejudice is arbitrary and capricious.

Concern ID:

29421

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Under the Preferred Alternative, Fort Funston would yet again become underused or unsafe (crime will increase) because the majority of visitors at this site are dog walkers; Fort Funston is currently safe because of dog presence and dog walkers at

- Representative Quote(s):* [this site.](#) **Corr. ID:** 1004 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
- Comment ID:** 191735 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
- Representative Quote:** What will happen to Fort Funston if you put these restrictions in place?even the shared plan? It will be empty and deserted; in short time it will provide the perfect location for shady deals, drug users and homeless encampments, and it will not be a safe place nor a clean place to visit. It will no longer be a place of civic pride. And as for environmental impact, I am sure the litter, broken glass, beer bottles, syringes etc. that are left behind will have its own sad environmental impact. Which of these options pays a greater price? Has anyone considered this? Are you really convinced that lots of people will come to use this park when you severely restrict off-leash dog use? These are the same people who currently do not use all the other parks available to them where dogs are not permitted at all.
- Corr. ID:** 2946 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
- Comment ID:** 203446 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
- Representative Quote:** I am a senior (AARP card carrying), Asian, single female. I am a native San Franciscan. I do not want you to take away or limit off-leash dog walking at Fort Funston. I tried walking at Fort Funston in the late 70's early 80's but stopped due to the type of people I encountered there. (Lewd behavior directed toward myself a single female just trying to get some outdoor exercise, and groups of young men drinking/smoking-making it quite uncomfortable). Revisiting the area in the late 80's to present time I am so happy that there are people there that proudly use the space. Off-leash dogs have made the area safe for people like me who just want to walk and not worry about crime. Dog people are friendly, conscientious and are always willing to help. The place is no longer isolated-making it a deterrent to those who would use it for unsavory activities (drugs, homeless encampments, etc.). The dogs being off-leash keep people from wanting to sleep in the bushes. The one person who does sleep there leaves before 8am. I feel SAFE walking at Fort Funston. If you limit off-leash dog walking at Fort Funston, you will also see a new problem at the Fort. Feral cats. Cats will come, stay, breed and soon the birds that exist there will be wiped out. Cats hunt and kill birds. Dogs may chase but I have never seen one catch a bird. I have seen cats kill birds and there have been numerous studies showing the negative impact on bird populations by cats. Finally, crime in the neighboring area will increase. The cars parked around the Lake will get broken into. I know most of Marin county's GGNRA do not have off leash dog access and there is no real problem with the above issues but Marin is isolated compared to Fort Funston. It is not easily accessible. There is a bus stop across the street from Fort Funston and it is walking distance from homes, shopping, BART etc. Take the dogs away and crime will come. Take the dogs away and the cats will come.
- Corr. ID:** 3115 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
- Comment ID:** 201522 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
- Representative Quote:** The GGNRA's argument about public safety at Fort Funston specifically, is a poor one. Who else goes there? As a single woman, I do not feel comfortable hiking there by myself. Would families go there for a picnic? ...No, it is too windy. Fort Funston would become a magnet for partiers and vandals without all the dogs. The parking is great, it is remote and it bothers no one. If the argument is trash, there is very little. I think that most of the dog owners, and walkers, really respect this wonderful place. Sometimes I go twice a day and I have

never seen a Ranger patrol the area.

Corr. ID: 4036 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207174 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Funston, the area is somewhat dangerous because of the cliffs; the beach is very hard and steep to get to and virtually deserted. The parasailers take off in a different area. Literally, everyone on the "dog side" is there with a dog. We have an entire coastline of beach access that is far easier to use where "dogless" folks go. The reason people started using Funston with their dogs is because it was deserted and rather undesirable as beaches go. Ban dogs and you'll just end up with a deserted beach again!

Corr. ID: 4709 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209765 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe the analysis for indirect impacts to adjacent lands isn't accurate either- no impacts are anticipated for areas at Fort Funston, but when Fort Funston's proposed off-leash area becomes so crowded, dog owners may go to other areas, creating visitor and other resource impacts. In the 1970's and early 80's, Fort Funston was a cesspool of illegal activity. By walking dogs at Fort Funston, dog owners have transformed this part of the park into safe community of people who look out for each other - as well as the environment.

Concern ID:

29422

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative at Fort Funston because the proposed off-leash areas are too small; 2 acres of off-leash areas out of the total 270 acres at Fort Funston is not acceptable.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1057 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192155 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: What I cannot understand is why anyone else would use Fort Funston unless they just wanted to walk on the beach. Why such severe restrictions on the ROLA size is what puzzles me. It also seems that having a dog on the beach is just about eliminated in your preferred plan.

I do like the idea of having commercial dog walkers get permits. I realize this is a difficult task but the plan is too restrictive for my needs.

Corr. ID: 1810 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191789 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have skimmed through your 1166 page document and studied your arguments for restricting off leash dog walking in Fort Funston to a couple of acres out of more than two hundred and seventy, I am more than appalled, I'm outraged.

I have seldom seen any visitor to Fort Funston without dogs except the hang glider folks. I have never seen a horse on those nicely marked horse trails and I have never encountered anyone whose fear of dogs made them feel deprived of the pleasure of strolling through the area. People without dogs have infinite beaches to stroll on where dogs are not allowed or under leash control. I have never seen a Snowy Plover. The Bank Swallows have more problems with the unstable cliffs than with dogs.

Corr. ID: 1824 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191931 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am strongly against making Fort Funston dog owners keep their dogs on leashes. It has been an off leash area for decades, and you have

no rational reason to change it now. I've reviewed your new Dog Management Plan, and it is an outrage. You intend to restrict off-leash walking to 2 small areas.

Corr. ID: 2286 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201161 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1. Fort Funston. Much too small an off leash area in a park that has traditionally been off leash for the entire area except for areas that are under renovation. Fort Funston is a dog park. Keep it that way.

Corr. ID: 2933 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202217 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have 2 dogs which I currently take to Fort Funston once or twice a week. I love the fact that there is a place to take my dogs to run, off-leash, that is so accessible to San Francisco. We all enjoy it.

I, of course, would prefer that all of Fort Funston was available for off-leash dog walking. I respect the off-limits, native vegetation areas, and keep my dogs from running through them. I think that most others do as well, but know that it's not 100 percent.

I realize that people have different needs, and we all need to compromise. That said, we are fortunate in the Bay Area to have many areas where we can go to enjoy a walk in nature, and only a few where dogs can run off-leash. If the off-leash area needs to be restricted, then so be it. However, I feel the currently recommended area is much too small. I'm not sure of the reasoning for such a limited space and would hope for at least 2 to 3 times the area that is currently proposed.

As I said, Fort Funston is a place that both my dogs and I enjoy. Please don't put restrictions in place that will keep this San Franciscan from enjoying this unique bit of the Bay Area.

Corr. ID: 4231 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208570 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston, the GGNRA area that I go to most often with my dogs, is not a natural habitat; the building of the batteries over 60 years ago removed the native vegetation and most of the native wildlife. This makes it an ideal area for dogs to run off-leash. The wildlife and vegetation that now exist are clearly compatible with such uses or they would not be there. Any effects of dog recreation on the snowy plover could be taken care of by a low fence that would keep dogs out of the nesting areas rather than by a ban on off-leash dog use over most of the park.

The GGNRA should be realistic and notice that the main reason people go to Fort Funston is to have fun with their dogs running and playing; they do not go for the area's scenic features. The proposed area near the parking lot where off-leash dogs would still be allowed under the draft plan is much too small to accommodate the number of dogs that visit this park. Any dog behaviorist will confirm that dog "incidents" are much more frequent in crowded areas and between dogs that are on leashes. With plenty of space, the dogs and people all work it out. There is certainly no factual record of incidents in the draft plan that would justify the proposed limitations.

Concern ID:
CONCERN

29423

[Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative at Fort Funston because the layout of](#)

STATEMENT:

the off-leash and on-leash areas do not make sense (does NOT include issues with access), including but not limited to: on-leash areas and ROLAs have no shade; the two ROLAs should be connected by an off-leash area; ROLAs are located in the coldest/windiest locations at Fort Funston.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1548

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200082

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I regularly (at least twice/month) take my dog to Fort Funston where she is off-leash. I have reviewed the plan for Fort Funston and offer the following comments:

It makes no sense to have an off-leash area at the top, a leashed area, and then an off-leash area down at the beach. The lack of continuity makes no sense and will encourage those who are not responsible to leave their dogs off-leash all over. There should be a way to get down to the beach that does not require a dog to be on-leash

I understand the need to protect wild flora and fauna. A balance can be achieved. It is not clear from the DEIS that any effort really was made to find a balance. Please keep in mind this is a national recreation area. It is not a national park. Dogs, as well as people, need exercise.

These lands are in the public trust for everyone and all uses. If there are irresponsible dog owners and dangerous dogs, they should be treated accordingly. The vast majority of current park users are not.

Corr. ID: 3722

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202323

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've attended 2 NPS meetings as well as the SF Supervisors meeting to learn about the Draft Proposals for the GGNRA and have been utterly dismayed at the extreme reductions in on/off-leash recreation outlined for dogs and their guardians. 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, I'd 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.

The DEIS fails to consider that the GGNRA is the front/back yard for a large metropolitan area. The fundamental purpose of creating the GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) for residents of the Bay Area. 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..

Corr. ID: 4592

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209997

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preferred alternative for Fort Funston is a poorly chosen site. The preferred alternative for Fort Funston confines off-leash recreation to the coldest and windiest area. We jokingly referred to this as the "tundra," and

trudge through it to get to the protected areas, out of the cold near the trees or on the protected side of the hills. The most protected area, i.e. where it is comfortable to walk even during rain showers, is the horse trail on the eastern side, where the preferred alternative would completely ban dogs. The current status of off-leash should be maintained, since it allows a variety of landscapes and experiences.

The preferred alternative for Fort Funston restricts recreation from the northern end of the beach. The justification for this is unclear. Yes there are shorebirds there, but shorebirds and dogs have co-existed there for decades. Yes there are bank swallows there, but again, there is no evidence that dogs have harmed the bank swallows or the nesting sites (which are on sheer cliffs).

Concern ID: 29424

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The Preferred Alternative is opposed because off-leash dogs are allowed at Fort Funston; Alternative D should be selected or dogs should be prohibited or restricted to on-leash use at Fort Funston.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2882 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202913 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dogs at Fort Funston should either be prohibited or restricted to on-leash use. This is a wonderful spot for hikes and picnics, but it has become a de facto dog run, overrun with off-leash dogs that tear up the area and leave their droppings everywhere, and they fight and scare older folks and children.
Corr. ID: 4315 **Organization:** State of California Department of Fish and Game
Comment ID: 209393 **Organization Type:** State Government
Representative Quote: Fort Funston

The NPS Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) differs from the Environmentally Preferable Alternative in the designation of a ROLA on the beach south of the Beach Access Trail and designation of a ROLA between the parking lot and Sunset Trail. Under Alternative D, dogs would be required to be leashed on the beach, dogs would be excluded off-trail between the parking lot and Sunset Trail, and a ROLA would be established at a site adjacent to the Habitat Protection Area. As stated in the draft EIS, the adoption of Alternative C at this site is likely to result in minor adverse impacts to coastal dune vegetation, long-term major adverse impacts on wildlife, and long-term minor-to-moderate adverse impacts to San Francisco lessignia. DFG recommends that Alternative D be selected as the adopted alternative, as it would, by requiring dogs to be leashed on the beach and excluding dogs off trail between the parking lot and Sunset Trail, avoid impacts to coastal dune vegetation and San Francisco lessignia which may result from trampling, digging, and dog waste; impacts to birds which may result from repeated flushing; and impacts to marine mammals which may result from biting, barking, or physical contact.

FF1300 - Fort Funston: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29425

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters support Alternative A because there is no problem with the current conditions; dogs are not damaging the environment and/or affecting wildlife or are not causing issues at Fort Funston.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1583 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190806 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support Alternative A (no change) for Fort Funston. Fort Funston is a very important park for me, my family and our dog. We enjoy walking on the paths and the beach. This is not a pristine park - it is an urban oasis. For Funston will never be Yosemite or Yellowstone. Walking at Fort Funston you can not forget you are in an urban area = you hear the traffic, the Pacific Gun Club and scores of folks waalking together. Perhaps fencing the trail areas to keep dogs from the sensitive areas (suggestion).

Corr. ID: 3758 **Organization:** SFDOG

Comment ID: 204623 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The changes the GGNRA is proposing are very harsh and limiting. Over the years I have watched Ft Funston change but that was due to the weather no the dogs or even the people.

Please leave Ft Funston off leash. Do not limit the areas of access or make it off lease

Concern ID:

29426

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support Alternative A because it allows the most off-leash dog walking of all the alternatives for dogs to exercise and/or it preserves the recreational uses at Fort Funston.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 328 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181091 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have reviewed all the options for Fort Funston and Ocean Beach, the two areas where I regularly walk my two dogs. I vehemently support Option A, which allows me to keep my pets under voice control, and strongly protest all other options.

Corr. ID: 1721 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191172 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have owned and walked dogs in both places. Specifically, I enjoy Crissy Field, Ft. Funston, and the Linda Mar/Sharp Park beaches with my dog and child.

I feel very strongly about maintaining off-leash areas in these locations. Open lands and our natural resources belong to all of us, and as a law-abiding tax-payer, I wish to protest further restrictions in our beautiful wild places.

Corr. ID: 3620 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204082 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been walking my dog at Fort Funston for the last 15 years and am very familiar both with the terrain and with Fort Funston's history with regard to off-leash dog-walking over that period of time. Although I regret GGNRA's proposed dog-walking restrictions in many of the areas covered by the Management Plan, I am limiting my comments to the restrictions proposed for Fort Funston because I believe that they cannot be justified by GGNRA's own research or objectives and will result in significant hardship for San Francisco's dog-owners.

Of the available alternatives, I believe that the NPS should adopt Alternative A (no action) with regard to Fort Funston because it does the most to preserve off-leash areas for dogs. In my opinion, Alternative E is misleadingly titled as providing "Most Dog-Walking Access" because in fact the areas open to dog-walking would be less than those under Alternative A. I urge the NPS to clarify this point to the

public and to take the possibility of confusion into consideration when reviewing public support for Alternative E.

Principal Reasons for Favoring Alternative A

1. Importance of preserving Off-Leash Areas for Dogs. Other than the horse, it is difficult to imagine another species that has had as lasting and beneficial a relationship with humans than the dog. It's important that the NPS balance many factors when considering the appropriate use of lands under its purview. However, just as the NPS takes into consideration threats to endangered species, it is entirely appropriate that the NPS also consider our species' obligation to provide adequate exercise for a species whose ongoing contributions to humankind cannot be overstated.

The fact is that requiring dogs to get virtually all of their exercise at the end of a 6' long leash is simply cruel. Dogs cannot get their natural exercise needs fulfilled walking at the pace of a human.

The opportunities for off-leash exercise for dogs are already extremely limited in San Francisco and elsewhere and will become more so if the NPS management plan is enacted. Fort Funston has long been one of the few areas in San Francisco where dogs can enjoy off-leash exercise with relatively few negative impacts to the environment and disruption to other users. It should be managed in a way that will allow it to continue to fulfill this important purpose. Indeed, this is a cultural resource in its own right and deserves protection.

Corr. ID: 4540 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209780 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The allowable off-leash area currently available at Fort Funston perfectly meets the recreational and social needs of people and dogs alike. I feel that the "preferred alternative" choice that I learned of failed, seriously, to accurately analyze the need for residents of this urban area.

I trust that the GGNRA, in developing a general management plan, will take into consideration and respect the specific character and situation of the Fort Funston Area. I fully support Alternative A, the No Action alternative of the DEIS, as it relates to Fort Funston.

Concern ID:

29427

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There is support for Alternative A because there are few or no other comparable places to Fort Funston for owners to take their dogs off-leash in the Bay Area.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 175 **Organization:** P.O.O.C.H.

Comment ID: 182287 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are precious few places where dogs can be safely and legally walked off-leash. Please don't take one of the last, and nicest, Fort Funston, away from us.

Corr. ID: 493 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181849 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is important to me that Fort Funston remains as it is. There is no other place where we can take our dog for a walk off leash. There are many other beautiful places in the Bay area for people to take walks and enjoy nature without dogs, but Fort Funston is one of the few places were we and bring our dogs and let them run free.

Corr. ID: 535 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181945 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a dog owner in the Bay Area we love Fort Funston and drive the 45 + min drive there to enjoy time with our furry family member. Sometimes we don't always go down to the beach so it's nice to have the trails on the bluff as off leash so our Stella can roam and enjoy time off leash as well. There are so few areas in the Bay Area that dogs can enjoy off leash with their owners. All the times we have been there we've never seen anyone with out of control dogs. You see lots of families and everyone seems to pick up after their furry family member. It would truly be a shame for you to change anything about the park at this point.

Corr. ID: 1810 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191790 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The beachfront your proposal allows is nice, thank you. However it is the only legal beach in the Bay area. California State Parks do not allow dogs at all and most municipal jurisdictions do not permit off leash activity. Since GGNRA now possesses so much of the San Francisco bay/ocean front lands, I mean all; my appeal to you is to continue the current off leash dog policy for the Fort Funston area forever.

Corr. ID: 3484 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203332 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep Fort Funston an off-leash play area for dogs. People who take their dogs there are super respectful of the habitat areas, always pick up dog waste, and only take dogs off leash that are social, friendly and under good voice control. It is one of the few areas in the Bay Area where dogs can really run, people can enjoy a scenic vista, and dogs can swim and play with lots of other friendly dogs. It would really be a shame to take one of the only outdoor places that is possible away from the dogs of the Bay Area and the people that love them.

Concern ID:

29428

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters support Alternative A because there are access and/or leash issues for visitors, including the mobility-impaired, with the other alternatives proposed at Fort Funston.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1205 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194839 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Of your plans, if changed must be made, Map 16A is a compromise alternative that is viable and fair to all. It is also the only plan that will work well for seniors.

Please take seriously the detrimental effects the more severe restrictions will have on the health and welfare of seniors who have so long diligently and reverentially cared for Fort Funston.

Corr. ID: 1516 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190673 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a dog walker who frequents Fort Funston. I pick up twice as much poop as dogs I walk almost every time I am there as well as plastic bags & other trash from people.

Dogs are my life & I do not want them to loose the freedom of being off leash at the beach. However, as a 54 year old woman I can not physically handle taking 6 dogs down to the beach via on leash walking. They are anxious to run & I tho very healthy I can't handle their pulling & excitedness. I do have them trained to come

via voice control & this should be sufficient for them & me. Well behaved dogs & responsible owners/dog walkers will be punished by these plans. I think the best alternative is to NOT change the usage areas, rather to enforce the rules regarding picking up poop & managing dog behavior.

Corr. ID: 1579 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190801 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The only way for my two dogs and I to get any exercise is an off leash jog. I can't run with two leashes with the possibility of tripping. Many who have their dogs off leash is the only way to truly let their dogs free to explore. They are couped up in the house and it is only when they are at these off leash parks do they really feel free.

I pay my good tax dollars to enjoy they parks. Why would I have my tax dollars enforcing these ROLA areas that I did not want in the first place.

Corr. ID: 1704 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191125 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The everyday users of Fort Funston would like to see it remain as is. It is a safe place for both people and dogs and receives maximum usage. The parking area is full on the weekends, 75 percent full or more on the weekdays. Changing the policy will not increase the amount of use. Educating the users of the park in ways to preserve both the current use and the natural surrounds would be great. For many elderly people Fort Funston is great because they can walk themselves and their dogs. Many elderly have a difficult time leash-walking. I think more of the regular Fort Funstoners would be willing to stay out of a few sensitive areas as long as the majority of the park remains off-leash. Pacifica will be impacted negatively by any change to Fort Funston.

Corr. ID: 1716 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191161 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: III) Because of physical limitations, I (+ many others) can not go down the cliff in Fort Funston. I want to continue to walk my well behaved dogs along the cliff.

Corr. ID: 2100 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193345 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no way to get down to the beach @ Fort Funston unless a person can handl their anxious dog(s) (heading to the beach!) on leash down hill in sand or stairs - NOT ALL PEOPLE CAN DO THIS - old folks, disabled, etc.

Corr. ID: 2103 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193354 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ft. Fun - if the proposed off-leash area is limited to the sand dunes I am denied access to walking with my dog (I walk, haltingly, with a cane + I do not have good footing).

Corr. ID: 4039 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207222 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A primary issue for our family's dog care is my physical mobility. With the GGNRA's current dog policy, paved trails at both Fort Funston and Crissy Field enable me to participate actively in exercising our dogs. According to the Executive Summary, Alternatives B & D would completely bar me from being able to exercise my dogs at Crissy Field and Alternatives C & D would allow some, though very restricted (and likely very crowded) off-leash beach access. At Fort Funston, all options other than Alternative A would restrict off-

leash dog activity from all wheelchair accessible trails. This, in effect, makes the area closed to wheelchair users who need to provide off-leash exercise for their dogs.

Concern ID: 29429

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative E because it allows for a balance of off-leash, on-leash, and no-dog areas and/or still allows for protection of the environment.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 45 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181775 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: PLAN E FOR FORT FUNSTON IS BY FAR THE BEST ALTERNATIVE, IN MY OPINION. IT GIVES ALL PET OWNERS THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF OFF-LEASH SPACE WHILE STILL PRESERVING AREAS FOR OTHER HABITATS.

Corr. ID: 1213 **Organization:** Tinkering School

Comment ID: 194861 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a user of Fort Funston, Mori Point, and Rancho Corral de Tierra (the area just north of Montara) and am requesting that you choose Alternative E.

Corr. ID: 1703 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191123 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There needs to be more ROLA areas accessible @ Mori Point + Crissy field for Elderly & Handicapped people. Fort Funston (16E) is the better choice for the off leash area/or not just along the ocean -

Corr. ID: 1706 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191133 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston: Map 16-E would provide enough off-leash access and preserve natural settings too in my opinion.

Corr. ID: 1744 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191212 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Fuston

Plan 16E is the best of the group. I suggest making the wasteland between the parking lot and the water fountain also off leash. Most of the time it is so blustery you need to cover your face to avoid getting sand in your face. That would be hard to do holding leashes.

The dogs often find this section the best areas for elimination and it is easiest to find and clean up (Mine like their privacy so they wouldn't do their business if they were on leash).

I also think the park should continue to be posted as a high dog use area so people can choose to hike elsewhere if they wish to avoid dogs. The trails don't need them to be on leash only.

Corr. ID: 3145 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202687 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am against the proposed on-leash areas for Fort Funston. This area is and has been a wonderful resource for walkers, dogs and their owners. I would support the alternative given on Map 16E. It's expansive land area for off-leash dogs could accommodate walkers and dogs of various abilities.

Concern ID: 29430

CONCERN STATEMENT: There is support for Alternative D because it allows the least amount of off-leash and on-leash areas for dog walking at Fort Funston, and will generally protect the natural resources at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1544 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 190729 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Ft. Funston

No VC anywhere + esp. on trails - everyone (dogs, people, horses) controlled on trails. If what dog owners want is beach access, fine - but confined to smallest area possible.

Prefer 16D, Can live w/ only beach area on 16C

Corr. ID: 4354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209528 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: FORT FUNSTON

The fort has a large number of people who have used it for dog walking and sociability for many years. It is severely eroded in large places. Watching dogs run and chase balls and sticks I see them move from denuded areas into areas which have been or could be rehabilitated for habitat, rather than given over to sand and ice-plant. Post and rail (coated wire) fencing such as is used on Milagra Ridge and Crissy Field is needed here, both to keep dogs out of vegetated or re-vegetating habitat and to give people and dogs a definite place to be or a clear path along which to move. Such fencing does not have to dominate the landscape. I favor Alternative D which provides an upland area for the dogs and also a part of the beach as shown on the maps. There should be a connecting ROLA path between the upland and the beach, fenced as necessary to keep animals and people out of habitat.

Concern ID: 29432

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative B.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4683 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 210182 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: FORT FUNSTON

Alternatives A, C and E are all unacceptable for reasons mentioned above. Alternative C, the preferred alternative, is much too permissive and will only perpetuate the culture of destroying the resource. Remember this is a dune-based natural resource, so even seemingly benign uses such as the ROLA between the Chip Trial, Sunset Trail and the parking lot will continue to wear away the under) Ing compressed dunes and will continue the destruction of this unique place. Alternatives B and D do nothing to really repair the damage to the Fort Funston resource.

Alternatives B and D offer some level of protection. We much prefer Alternative B.

FF1400 - Fort Funston: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29433

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Fees - Commenters suggest commercial dog walkers should also be charged a registration fee. Money generated from the fees can be used to fund maintenance and restoration projects in the area.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 598

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222177

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - 3. Make and enforce guidelines for the number of dogs allowed per walker. It is reasonable that "professional" dog walkers, who are, after all, making commercial use of the parks for their own profit, should be held to a strict standard, perhaps including some kind of registration/licensing requirement, with the provision that violations could result in losing their license.

Corr. ID: 1137

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192473

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In San Francisco, the cumulative effect of the current preferred alternatives would bring a drastic reduction in the percentage of overall off leash areas leading to over-crowding of remaining off leash areas and an increase in the risk of dog related issues and injuries. Please reconsider, especially at Baker Beach and Fort Funston.

Below are some other ideas for help with land preservation without the complete shut-down of areas:

- 1.) License or use fees for dog walkers/more than 3 dogs contributing funds for maintenance/preservation
- 2.) Use fee per dog for certain areas contributing funds for maintenance/preservation

Corr. ID: 3747

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222074

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - We suggested the following programs to be explored since we are advocates of Alternative A:

1. Have dog walkers register with the GGNRA to establish proper channels of communication and documented compliance.

Concern ID:

29434

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

No Dogs - Commenters suggested that areas within Fort Funston should not have dog walking so all visitors can enjoy the area and for protection of natural resources. Suggestions for no dog areas included the following: areas north of the intersection of the Coastal Trail, Beach Access, and Sunset Trail; areas south of the parking lot; all beach areas; and hang gliding area.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1185

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222076

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: After reviewing all of your proposed plans for Fort Funston, enforceability is a major issue. Having said that, I would suggest an easier plan to enforce - use the parking lot as a dividing line. Limit, not only off leash walking, but dogs altogether in all areas south of the parking lot, leaving all areas north of the parking lot to off leash dog walking. Families who wish to picnic and enjoy the beach could do so without dogs. It is much easier to access the beach down the stairs then to access the beach through the paths at the north end of Funston. Remember, you have no restrooms other than those in the parking lot. Families walking their children down to the beach via the north end of Funston discover no restrooms. We all know what happens then.

Corr. ID: 1522

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190686

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) Fort Funston beach should be no dogs. The shore birds have a difficult enough time and even dogs on-leash disturb them by barking and lunging at them.

Corr. ID: 1894

Organization: Hang Gliding Assoc. of Canada

Comment ID: 200310

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep Fort Funston an off leash dog park. I would like to see the hang gliding area and the fields behind the hang gliding area closed to dogs but please keep the rest of the park open to off leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 1913

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222159

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: FoFu- Have hang-glider area be in the no dog zone for safety of dogs & people.

Corr. ID: 2073

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193335

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston is a prime gem of a location in SF that should be able to be enjoyed by people who don't like/are afraid of dogs. The current plan has the prime beach front as off leash - reduce or move the off leash to different location.

Corr. ID: 3860

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205550

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is time to restrict dogs in the national park lands - on and off leash. People should be able to enjoy most, if not all, of the waterfront beaches of San Francisco and in the Bay Area park lands without dogs.

Fort Funston should have very restricted dog use - most of the land at Fort Funston should be dog free for everyone to enjoy - how did it ever become a dog park?

Corr. ID: 4016

Organization: San Francisco resident

Comment ID: 206842

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to recommend Fort Funston ALTERNATE B with the following modifications:

-At the intersection of the (Coast Trail, Beach Access and Sunset Trail), and heading north, limit this area to non-dog-walking activities for the protection of the Bank Swallow and for users that are not comfortable with dogs.

Corr. ID: 4215

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208901

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - We appreciate that this is a challenging unit for the GGNRA, and find most of the Preferred Alternative acceptable, and a big improvement over the status quo. However, as in other units we have named, this again is a place that will not allow an experience free of unwelcome interactions with dogs. We would propose that the Coastal Trail north of the beach access, or even north of the drinking fountain, be no-dog. We also propose that the seasonal beach closure be year-round. Both of these actions still allow two large ROLAs and ample access to both, but would also greatly increase the ability of bird watchers and other visitors to enjoy the wonderful natural resources of this important park unit without the interruption caused by the presence of dogs.

Concern ID: 29435
CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA Rotation - Commenters suggest closing certain sections of the park in shifts (rotate ROLAs) as necessary to aid in natural resource preservation.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1137 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 222080 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fort Funston -
3.) Temporarily closing sections for maintenance, re-growth, etc.; Shifting land use to help preservation
Corr. ID: 1466 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 222085 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fort Funston - I am also in support of ROLAs being rotated so the land is not overused and if conflicts arise, an on-leash policy being implemented. That is safer for everyone. I am also in favor of fenced in dog run areas as an alternative but I feel that Alternate C is a much better direction to take.

Concern ID: 29436
CONCERN STATEMENT: Fencing - Commenters suggest using fences/barriers and possibly entrance gates to keep off-leash dogs in certain areas at Fort Funston. Fences should be used to easily distinguish areas where dog walking is or is not allowed. Suggested areas for fencing or natural barriers include the following: areas along the bluffs; damaged area near the main parking lot (fenced ROLA); and along trails.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 279 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 222166 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fort Funston - 3. Improved demarcation and maintenance of trails to keep dogs off the vegetation.
Corr. ID: 1740 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191199 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Please consider putting up better barriers & fences to protect the land and plants that you (GGNRA) do not want harmed. A lot, if not all, barriers at Funston are insufficient & ineffective. Most are posts (low posts) with wires. When it's windy, a lot of these barriers are covered completely. Dogs AND people can easily cross these barriers. Its not only dogs that cross these barriers into plants. Many times at Funston, there are people who walk onto the protected plants & they're not even with a dog.

If you want to preserve plants please consider more effective barriers that will prevent dogs & humans from crossing. Humans are at fault too. Not just dogs.

Also, please replace the fence on the west end of the park. This fence has been down for about 1-2 years now & is a real safety hazard to all dogs AND people.

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 222067 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fort Funston Comment: The DEIS should be changed to:

- provide more fenced in area for wildlife habitat, for equestrian trails and for protection of dogs at edge of bluffs, while continuing to provide additional off leash play areas. The DEIS fails to support claim that fencing will impede wildlife and will affect view.

Corr. ID: 2905 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202643 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ft. Funston - I support the Preferred Alternative for Ft. Funston. To improve upon the Preferred Alternative, I suggest installing a fence, with access gates and adequate signage, along the border of the ROLA north of the main lot. A borderline fence will clearly delineate the boundary of the ROLA and will minimize compliance problems and visitor conflict.

Corr. ID: 3148

Organization: Habitat Restoration Team

Comment ID: 202777

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The area near the main parking lot at Fort Funston has been completely destroyed by dogs. No plants grow. It is nothing but bare earth. It is very ugly, but, having destroyed an area where *Chorizanthe cuspidata* var. *cuspidata* (a rare plant) was found when I censused the area in the 1990s, it should be fenced and dogs allowed to roam the enclosure without restraints.

Corr. ID: 3608

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon

Comment ID: 203973

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ft. Funston - I support the Preferred Alternative C for Ft. Funston. To improve upon the Preferred Alternative, I suggest installing a fence, with access gates and adequate signage, along the border of the ROLA north of the main lot. A borderline fence will clearly delineate the boundary of the ROLA and will minimize compliance problems and visitor and wildlife conflicts. Signs should be posted clearly identifying the area as an off-leash dog play area and stating the regulations. The Bank Swallow nesting area should be protected by signage and enforcement.

Last, I strongly recommend restoring the coastal scrub habitat at Ft. Funston. I used to visit Fort Funston to see the birds and marine mammals from the bluffs and beach. Now I do not visit Fort Funston nor do I take friends or visitors to this location as it is a "dogs in control" area. Plant and animal species, as well as park visitors, have been displaced from Ft. Funston over time as off leash dog activities have increased. Dogs and dog owners have caused erosion damage to the Bank Swallow nesting site by scaling the bluff. Shorebirds that have migrated great distances are flushed by off leash dogs. A proactive effort must be made to bring back the visitors who are interested in proper stewardship of this area of the park.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Dog Management Plan. I encourage you to adopt the best measures to protect the National Park's valuable resources for future generations and for wildlife.

Corr. ID: 3812

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208448

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2. I believe that the proposed alternative at Fort Funston will not work unless the park fences the trails to keep visitors and dogs on trail. My experience working at Fort Funston has shown that unless fences are present, dogs will roam wherever their owners allow. That said, I suggest making the trails very wide, say 15 or 20 feet, to allow plenty of room for visitors with and without dogs to enjoy the trails. This will prevent a "fenced in" feeling, while allowing the park to restore the dune habitat that used to dominate Fort Funston. I don't believe the park can enforce leash laws or area restrictions without fences, and believe that fencing has worked in the northern portion of the site, allowing habitat restoration while also allowing dog owners and non-dog owners to enjoy the site.

Corr. ID: 4358

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209506

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We are also concerned about the preservation of the parks'

natural resources, but more balanced and reasonable options exist besides restricting dog-walking access. It is not even clear at Ft. Funston where dogs are not allowed. Better signage and the creation of environmental barriers would be a solution that could protect wildlife and vegetation, yet allow dogs off leash and their guardians to use the park.

Concern ID:

29437

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

ROLA - Commenters suggested changes to the location and size of the ROLAs at Fort Funston. An off-leash dog walking loop including the parking lot, staircase, beach trail, and beach should be allowed because on-leash dog walking along the steep, sandy beach trail would be unsafe for elderly and handicapped visitors. The area to the right of the parking lot should include a ROLA because during high tide the existing ROLA would not be accessible. Other suggestions included increasing the site of the existing ROLA by extending it north, moving the ROLA away from the cliffs due to safety reasons, and a loop trail including the Sunset Trail through Battery Davis then south to the ROLA near the parking lot.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 54

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181787

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This study also doesn't take into account the high-tide at Fort Funston. There are times when the entire beach is underwater. The preferred alternative would not allow anywhere for dogs to run at these times and we conscientious dog owners are there all year-round.

Corr. ID: 235

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222158

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - The beach from the pipe to the sand ladder trail could ROLA. This would provide a landmark (the pipe) to define the two areas. It would also allow dogs to access the "voice control" area from the North or South.

Corr. ID: 1319

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222069

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - Another problem is that there are many times the tide is too high to be on the beach in the zone proposed for the off lease zone and therefore is not usable. Keep the areas right of the parking lot and parking lot off leash.

Corr. ID: 1563

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222077

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - The notion that you would restrict the area of the park that has been altered the most from its native state lacks even the most basic logic. The area you intend to restrict dogs to being on leash (north from the parking lot to the beach access) is the area that would make the most sense to have the dogs off leash.

Corr. ID: 1717

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222073

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - If they must increase restrictions than they should at least create an area where people can get a good walk and the dog can get exercise. At the very least make the off leash are from the parking lot all the way to the beach access trail and also from the staircase to the bottom of the beach trail.

Anything less than this is destroying what is wonderful about Fort Funston.

Leave the following area off leash:

Entry loop from stairs to beach access trail, in loop including beach. Then enforce the rule!

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222068

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston

- Take into account that many cannot make difficult walk up and down steep, sandy trail to access beach. These folks are forced to rely on small off leash play area near parking lot.

Corr. ID: 1913

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192588

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: FoFu- Preferred alternative needs more ROLA area and clear division between ROLA and leashed or no dogs to provide more equitable division.

Corr. ID: 1916

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192596

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: FoFu- Please include a ROLA path to the beach in the preferred alternative.

FoFu - Extend the Alt. E ROLA to the north, and include it in the Preferred Alternative. There is no reason why you can't just fence off an area for the snowy plovers while they are laying.

Corr. ID: 1928

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222078

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Off leash needs to be more in the mix - not whittled down to nothing in the areas of Fort Funston & Crissy Field! Compromise means to allow the elderly ROLA access too!

Corr. ID: 3745

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204606

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preferred alternative cannot be allowed to go forward. It is more than too restrictive, Parts of it are downright dangerous. Having the off-leash area at Funston be an area that borders the cliffs and the parking lot, given that the density in that area will be greatly increased shows a complete disregard for the safety of the pets that will be using that area. Leashing packs of dogs while descending to the beach is also a recipe for disaster.

Corr. ID: 4690

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210080

Organization Type: Federal Government

Representative Quote: Lastly, many of my constituents regularly visit the Fort Funston beach area with their dogs and are concerned with the preferred alternative restrictions. While I join them in commending the fact that the proposal would maintain the beach area as off leash, I ask that you reexamine the plateau area restrictions. Specifically, commercial dog walkers and non-commercial dog walkers alike have shared with me that they would like the open field area just north of the drinking fountains to remain off leash, rather than prohibited to dogs altogether, as the plan proposes. As you know, dogs would benefit most from the span if they are able to run around off leash and this space has been historically used for that purpose.

Concern ID:

29438

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[Time Restrictions - Commenters have suggested time constraints \(week vs. weekday, seasonal, hours of day\) for off-leash dogs at ROLAs \(including seasonal](#)

restrictions for bank swallows; moveable keep out signs for hang gliding areas) or at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 279

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180932 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A better alternative for Fort Funston would be: 1. ROLA on the beach, switching to on-leash during vulnerable periods for Bank Swallows.

Corr. ID: 598

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182156 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My dog and I are frequent users of Crissy Field and Fort Funston. Although I am aware of some of the problems that have arisen due to off-leash dogs in these areas, I have personally never experienced them. The main reason, I believe, is that I go to these sites around sunrise, long before they are crowded and before professional dogwalkers arrive. My experience is that each place has a very regular and dedicated group of early arriverers. Because of the early hour and the low density of users, problems are extremely rare.

I urge those making this decision to consider the following:

2. The patterns of use at these parks vary during the day. Please allow continued use of existing off-leash areas at these parks during low use hours, e.g. from opening until 8:30 am and for an hour or two before closing time. The more stringent regulations should apply during higher-intensity use since there is much higher potential for conflict.

Corr. ID: 1319

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222072 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - The other option is to make no changes to off leash rules, but put a time limit on it. For example, only off leash from 6am-1pm.

Corr. ID: 1770

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191536 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If dog owners have adequate areas for off-leash activities at Fort. Funston, they will be more respectful of the restricted areas. They will even self-police uninformed dog walkers who enter restricted areas, with the understanding that we can all lose our privileges if a few dogs are allowed in the habitat areas. In regard to hang-gliders, they are at the Fort only on certain days and times when the conditions are right. Moveable "Keep Out signs can restrict that area from dogs only when the hang-gliders are present.

Corr. ID: 4243

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209219 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Lets take the Ft. Funston area in San Francisco as an example. As a dog owner even I will admit that that area IS NOT an area for any people with an aversion to dogs. So if I wanted to enjoy a picnic, walk, bicycle ride, horseback ride (?) etc., without canine interference, that could very well be an impossible undertaking there. A REASONABLE COMPROMISE might be to have alternating days/weeks/months (?) for dog owners/walkers and those who would enjoy the same area(s) dog free. For example, if I wanted to walk my dog leash free there tomorrow on the 18th, and I know that the day or week was off limits for dog owners/walkers, I would have to make other arrangements. I do not recommend month long hiatuses, one week intervals would probably be more compassionate toward dog owners/walkers (Another thing to keep in mind: professional dog

walkers use such areas as a source of income; to close such areas would force such people to lose income or perhaps livelihoods.) The alternating time frame idea, I believe, could work for ALL AREAS in question/dispute.

Concern ID: 29439

CONCERN STATEMENT: Signs - Clear signage stating the dog walking regulations and areas for ROLAs, on-leash dog walking, and no dog areas need to be available for visitors. Current signs stating wildlife areas need to be replaced or repaired. The use of appropriate signage will allow for better compliance.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 457 **Organization:** Tax Payer
Comment ID: 181728 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I believe there is a simple alternative to these expensive proposals. Keep things as is but add large signs warning that Ft. Funston is an off-leash dog haven and fence off any sensitive areas.

Corr. ID: 598 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222168 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1. Clearly posted guidelines help park users and enforcement personnel. When I first got a dog and began going to these parks, I found it very confusing that there were no posted guidelines for dogs and owners.

Corr. ID: 1466 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199819 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With that in mind, my biggest concern is a lack of signage that alerts people to the park's boundaries and the laws we all should follow. And what about charging people to park their cars at Fort Funston, a means to collect funds to help pay for signage and habitat restoration?

Corr. ID: 2326 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223768 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Fort Funston there is a small amount of visible signage to explain the wildlife situation. There are a few old, broken, and sand covered fences to delineate protected wildlife boundaries. The lack of clarity has led to a disregard. However, I have seen this disregard extend to all people not just people with dogs. I don't think dogs are really the problem - it is people. I am convinced that most people don't intend to be malicious or malfasant they just don't understand how their behaviors effect the big picture. They see acres of sandy open space with military remains and can't understand how someone thinks they are doing damage. So what if my dog and my kid dig in the sand?

Increase Signage and boundary delineations for protected areas

1. Explain what nature is vulnerable and needs our protection - help us be even prouder of our coast than we already are!
2. Expect - People behaviors and actions- specific guidelines ie: pack it in pack it out, keep out of certain areas
3. Expect - Canine behaviors and actions- specifics ie: pack it out - the poop, keep out of certain areas, no digging in certain spots
4. Expect - Other park users behaviors and actions with specific guidelines - bicycle, horse, hang gliding, picnickers, dune surfers, fisherman, joggers, remote flyers, etc
5. Community Service Projects so the youth can have education credits for helping snowy plover, native plant restoration or other wildlife.
6. Self Monitoring - each one teach one - self policing of expectations

Keep non critical areas open to off leash, then use boundaries, education and community to protect the rest.

Corr. ID: 2905

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222179

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Signs should be posted clearly identifying the area as an off-leash dog play area and stating the voice and sight control rules.

Additionally, I suggest aggressively restoring the coastal scrub habitat throughout Ft. Funston. Plant and animal species, as well as park visitors, have been displaced from Ft. Funston over time as dog play activities have increased. A proactive effort must be made to bring back the visitors who are interested in proper stewardship of this area of the park

Corr. ID: 4016

Organization: San Francisco resident

Comment ID: 222079

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - North of that intersection (Coast Trail, Beach Access and Sunset Trail) provide a second smaller parking area and accessible trail with signage noting dog walking is permitted at the southern parking area.

-Provide clear signage in both areas of expectations and reasons for the rules. In the 8 years I have been using Fort Funston there have been no rules posted at the parking area of Fort Funston.

Concern ID:

29440

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Education - Commenters suggested implementing more programs to educate visitors about important natural resources at the park in order to reduce dog walking in sensitive areas. Visitors should also be educated on dog walking regulations.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1913

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192589

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Educate stable owners of risk when it comes to riders in the areas where people walk their dogs @ ff - the less conflict between hang gliders, horseback riders, and dog walkers the better - more monitoring by park rangers.

Corr. ID: 2326

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201646

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston Specifically

Families + dogs + kids + education (and clear instructions on how to take care of nature) = the next generation of caretakers of GGNRA.

Use the existing community to help implement your goals of caretaking

By spending the budget on clear boundaries and education in the long run you will reach your goal of land and wildlife protection now and for generations to come at minimal expense. Use the existing community to implement these goals.

There are very few programs for adults, families and children to educate them regarding protecting the native flora and fauna, - so tell them.

Corr. ID: 3582

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203652

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I go to Fort Funston almost every day, with multiple dogs. My dogs (and myself) are very well trained. I pick up litter that often washes up on the beach. I also clean up after my dogs and other people's. I am confident in stating that I leave the park cleaner than I find it, each time I go. I am not the only one. Many San Franciscans who enjoy this area are also responsible environmentalists and nature-lovers. I propose fining or assigning community service/park clean up to people (dog-owners/walkers or otherwise) who act irresponsibly, rather than punishing the many people who might have dogs and use the park responsibly. I would be more than willing to involve myself and others in park clean-ups and restoration of the area. This is a far more reasonable solution than any of the proposed solutions or alternatives.

Concern ID:

31167

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Enforcement - There is a greater need for park rangers and law enforcement to police Fort Funston for compliance with dog walking regulations. A system should be established that would allow for visitors to easily report non-compliant dog walkers.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3747

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222075

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - 2. Post placards for an email address or website to report patrons who are damaging natural resources or endangering visitors of the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 4077

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207796

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do feel that things can be done to help preserve the area, but the plan put forward goes way to far. I would suggest:

- Rangers should patrol the area to enforce the new rules

Corr. ID: 4683

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210185

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: People who allow dogs off leash, regardless of regulations allow ing or disallowing that practice, should be held financially accountable for repaying the National Park Service, and the City and County of San Francisco if they are involved in a rescue, the full cost of any dog rescue from the bluffs and they should be fined for not controlling their dog appropriately in the first place. It is critical that the Fort Funston bluffs be preserved for the present and for future generations. In their own right, they are an amazing resource that the National Park Service has never protected, recognized or interpreted for the public. They show us a cross section of San Francisco geology going back thousands of years. The practice of allow ing off leash dogs and the public in general the freedom to destroy those bluffs is a violation of the public trust to preserve such resources. We hope at least this resource will be given the protection it needs when this plan is finalized.

Concern ID:

31168

CONCERN STATEMENT:

On-Leash - Commenters suggested that dogs should be on-leash in the hang gliding area and should also be required to leash dogs when horseback riders are in the area for safety concerns. On-leash dog walking should also be required on all trails to protect restored areas and sensitive resources and along the beach between the access trail and sewer outlet.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 235

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180754

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have raised, trained and handled dogs all my life. I don't currently own a dog, but go to Ft. Funston on a daily basis to be around dogs and hike. Since I "don't have a dog in this fight", I believe I am objective and can provide some insight. As a canine enthusiast, I still respect the fact that not everybody wants to be around dogs. I also realize that very few owners (or dog walkers for that matter!) actually have voice control of their dogs. I think the limit of 6 dogs for walkers is appropriate.

Regarding the "Preferred proposal": It seems workable and reasonable. The only flaw I see is that the "no dog area" North of the access trail is often inaccessible at high tide, due to a outcrop of rock from the cliff. I don't think this is fair to people who don't want to be around roaming dogs. I would keep the "no dog area", but make the beach (to the South) between the access trail and the sewer outlet pipe an on leash area.

Corr. ID: 279 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222165 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - 2. On leash on the trails north of the beach access.

Corr. ID: 1319 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222070 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - For the hang gliding area (left of the parking lot) should be on leash until 1/3 way down the stairs when a glider is in the area. Have signs posted. This protects the hang gliders and makes it still creates an open area for the dogs.

Corr. ID: 1319 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 222071 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - It should be required that if a dog owner see a horse that they must leash their dog, period.

Corr. ID: 2099 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193344 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Don't ban dogs from the horse trail at Fort Funston (or other areas) - but rather have rules to leash dogs when encountering horses (other users)

Corr. ID: 3148 **Organization:** Habitat Restoration Team

Comment ID: 222081 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston - In all other parts of Fort Funston dogs should be on leash and on trails. Having worked with others for years to restore the bluffs to native conditions, dogs should not be allowed into the protected areas. Staff and volunteer efforts to fence off sensitive areas have been compromised to allow dogs access to planted areas. Keeping them on leash will ensure that the thousands of hours of volunteer efforts to restore the Park will not be wasted. Just because we're free doesn't mean our labor shouldn't be valued.

FM1100 - Fort Mason: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29299

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Keep Fort Mason as an on-leash area so that all user groups can enjoy Fort Mason.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1079 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192214 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: our enjoyment of Fort Mason quickly turned to concern as we saw dogs running without supervision while their owners engaged in conversations. twice one of our children was aggressively approached by a large growling dog.

we've been forced to find other areas of the city to enjoy the outdoors with our family. the Fort Mason area in particular is a gem that deserves better management by the park service. later, we've been told, dog owners were ticketed and things have quieted down. until there are rules proscribing dogs off leash we will not be able to enjoy an area so close to our home.

Corr. ID: 1795 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200267 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully and strongly support all aspects of the plan pertaining to Ft. Mason, Crissy Field, and the Presidio beaches. And what I see are various forms of irresponsible dog ownership: off-leash dogs behind their owners, who therefore can't possibly see what their dogs are doing; multiple off-leash dogs going off in different directions, so their owners can't possibly keep track of all of them; owners on the phone with their dog so far ahead of them it is unlikely they can see; etc.

FM1200 - Fort Mason: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29302

***CONCERN
STATEMENT:***

Restricting dog walking activities at Fort Mason should not happen; punishing the majority of dog walkers for the few who do not follow the rules is unfair. Dogs should be allowed off-leash at Fort Mason. Commenters feel that during the weekdays this area has low visitor usage so it would provide a great area to allow a dog to exercise off leash. Commenters stated that this area is not environmentally sensitive so dogs should be allowed to be off leash.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 567 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182056 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Northern San Francisco (Marina, Cow Hollow, Russian Hill) is noticeably an area heavily populated by dogs and but lacking off leash dog parks. One of the few places that has been traditionally used for off leash recreation for many years is Crissy Field. Crissy Field should certainly retain the status quo and continue to fulfill this needed purpose. Fort Mason should also legalize off leash dog walking. So called "environmentalists" have argued the environmental impact that this would have on this park; however, I find these arguments weak as this is clearly a manicured urban park.

Corr. ID: 988 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191699 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: After reading the reasons behind the proposed changes to the GGNRA's pet policy, I am outraged that such arbitrary, illogical and ridiculous plans have been put forth to the people of San Francisco. I am particularly concerned with the plans for Crissy Field but would also like to voice my concern now that I think the plans for Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach are equally as ridiculous.

...you can't take this privilege away from everyone else when the amount of "bad" dogs is so small. Perhaps you could work with the city to increase the punishment for "unruly" or "aggressive" dogs instead of banning off leash areas for everyone?

Concern ID: 29305
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters believe that there is no technical or scientific basis for changing the current conditions at Fort Mason.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4088 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208349 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: And for the other sites that may fall through the cracks, I am very concerned that there is no technical or scientific basis for change at all of the Marin sites, Baker Beach (beach nudity is the biggest concern-not off leash dog walking), Lands End/Fort Miley and of course Upper Fort Mason. Folks have been walking their dogs off leash for years at Upper Fort Mason and even the late GGNRA Superintendent Brian O' Neill did not mind but actually enjoyed the dogs there. This area is primarily frequented by folks who live in the neighborhood who come with their dogs? a LOT of older people and working people who are very responsible and clean up after their dogs and there are VERY few dog conflicts.

FM1300 - Fort Mason: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29306
CONCERN STATEMENT: Alternative A is preferred since dog walking conditions have been working well.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 790 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 186017 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: My comments address Upper and Lower Fort Mason. The current circumstance has been Heaven. That is, Alternative-A, dogs on leash at all times is the preferred choice. No dogs in the garden.

Concern ID: 29310
CONCERN STATEMENT: Alternative C is preferred. Commenters believe that since this is not an environmentally sensitive area nor is it heavily used by visitors that ROLAs should be allowed.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 193 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182305 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I approve of increased restrictions, especially in wildlife sensitive or heavy use areas. near Fort Mason, I am in favor of Alternative C - ROLAs.
Corr. ID: 2224 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200830 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I favorably endorse alternative 9C for Ft.Mason park.
Corr. ID: 2888 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202949 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The rolling grassy field at Ft. Mason as well should be an area to be used for restricted off-leash dog use.

FM1400 - Fort Mason: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29300
CONCERN ROLAs - The Great Meadow should be an area for off-leash dog walking since it is

STATEMENT:

a developed lawn area. Another area for a ROLA should include the southern section of the Great Circle. All other areas should be for on-leash dog walking. Commenters believe that not allowing off-leash dog walking should not be based on other users of the area such as tourists or bicyclists.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 417

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181586

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Mason (proposed Alternative B): The current proposal requires dogs to be leashed, in favor of tourists on rented bicycles. The Great Meadow is a popular area for members of the community to meet and let their dogs run. Therefore, in interest of the community, it should be an off-leash area (at least the southernmost part, away from the main service road). All other specify areas (Laguna Green, grass, service road, housing, etc...) on-leash only. It's illogical to give favor to cyclists, as legally they aren't supposed to be riding on pathways through the Great Meadow, anyway. This would provide a largely on-leash park (since it is multi-use and already very developed) with respect to the prime area currently used for off-leash dog walking. Cyclists should NOT get priority, as they're the ones currently violating the law and, being on legally defined vehicles, a bigger threat.

Corr. ID: 1401

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195324

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do think that it's important to keep some of the more developed areas available for off-leash dogs, such as the Crissy Field lawn and Fort Mason's great lawn. Why not have these big lawns be available to dogs? I'd rather see dogs running there than through a pristine patch of coastal scrub in the Presidio. Lawns are huge wasters of water and fertilizer; if they can take some of the doggy need off of the beaches they will at least be serving some purpose.

Corr. ID: 4412

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207009

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ft. Mason

ELIMINATE LEASH REQUIREMENT IN THE GREAT CIRCLE

I have walked my dog on leash at Ft. Mason, and have no idea why dogs are required to be on leash in the great circle. At least during the weekdays, the area is practically unused, and would provide a great place to allow a dog to exercise off leash.

PROPOSED ROLA SHOULD BE SOUTH SECTION OF CIRCLE

I noticed that one of your proposals (although not the preferred proposal) would allow for a ROLA at a section of the park. I applaud that proposal, but would suggest that either, the entire circle be allowed for dog use, or that the section designated for the ROLA be the area of the great circle near the restrooms where the water fountains are located, as this area (in my experience) is less used than the section that leads between Ft. Mason and Aquatic Park.

Concern ID:

29301

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters feel that there should be no commercial dog walking, only one or two dogs per visitor, a compliance rate of 95 percent, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system at Fort Mason.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2905

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202640 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Ft. Mason - I support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, one dog per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Corr. ID: 3606 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon

Comment ID: 203955 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Ft. Mason - I support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, two dogs per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system

Corr. ID: 3608 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon

Comment ID: 203971 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Site Specific Comments

Ft. Mason - I support the Preferred Alternative B with the following changes: limit of three dogs per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Concern ID: 29304

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

No Dog Experience - There should be some areas of Fort Mason that are dog free areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4206

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208851 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think there should be at the least, sections of Fort Mason, East Beach, and Baker beach that are 100% NO DOG zones.

Concern ID: 29308

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Time of Day Restrictions - The plan should consider time of day, day of week, and season at Fort Mason. Commenters believe that this consideration would require less enforcement work for rangers, would benefit visitors who do not enjoy dogs, and benefit visitors who do enjoy off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2170

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200562 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would propose a compromise. Fort Mason would have limited ROLA hours to allow dog owners to have use of the Great Meadow but also allow other people the opportunity to enjoy the field without dogs.

Sat/Sun/Holidays would be on-leash only times. During the week there could be ROLA hours of approximately 3 - 6 or 7pm (depending on time of year). If a warm, sunny day fell during the week and there were a significant number of people without dogs using the field, rangers could suspend ROLA for that day. This compromise would require less enforcement work for rangers, would allow non-dog people to take advantage of the park when weather permitted, and, would give dog owners the chance to let their dogs run at the Great Meadow at those times when few other people are using the meadow.

Corr. ID: 4170

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208736 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Preferred Alternate Plan for Crissy Field and Fort Mason fails to consider 1.) time of day, 2.) day of week, and 3.) season.

1. Time of Day. During morning and evening hours there are often more people

walking their dog than people without a dog.

2. day of week. During weekdays all day, the quantity of people at Fort Mason and Crissy Field is minimal. Dog restrictions on use during weekdays is not warranted.

3. Season. During the cold, gray, raining, foggy months of the year the quantity of people at Fort Mason and Crissy Field is minimal. Dog restrictions during the wet season is not warranted.

At Crissy Field or Fort Mason, if restrictions are to be placed on off-leash dog walking, these restriction should only be put in place during the days and time when overcrowding warrants it.

In my opinion, the only times Crissy Field or Fort Mason warrant any off-leash dog restrictions, would be during the weekends, and only between 11 - 4 p.m., and only in specific verified overcrowded locations (the air-strip at Crissy is never over crowded)

Concern ID: 29309

CONCERN STATEMENT: [On-leash dog walking at the Great Meadow and a much smaller area in Laguna Green for dog walking.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1556 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190747 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Mason - Upper:

Dogs should be o-leash only at Great Meadow + a much smaller area in Laguna Green designated.
Preferred map 9-D.

Concern ID: 30341

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Fencing: The ROLA in alternative D should have a physical barrier to separate it from the Laguna Green area.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208896 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: We find the proposed Preferred Alternative either desirable or acceptable in the following sites, assuming the incorporation of our general comments: Fort Mason, Baker Beach and Ocean Beach. We believe the ROLA described in Fort Mason Alternative D would be acceptable if an adequate means of physical separation of the Laguna Green area could be identified. We are very pleased to see substantial areas without dogs on both Baker Beach and Ocean Beach. This is good for wildlife, vegetation and people

FP1100 - Fort Point: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29483

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The preferred alternative allows for maintaining current conditions, which benefits shorebirds, and maintains a beneficial visitor experience by providing areas where dogs are on-leash.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 10 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181424 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: the following are my comments on some of the various areas under review.

Fort Point: Alt A.

Corr. ID: 1182 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193559 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am commenting specifically on Crissy Field and Fort Point in the GGNRA, where I walk everyday. I support the GGNRA plan as outlined on the map. It is very important to have dogs on a leash on all sidewalks and paths. Dogs should be on a leash on all the beaches at Crissy Field and Fort Point area since the birds can be anywhere along the shore there.

FP1200 - Fort Point: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29484

CONCERN STATEMENT: The current situation at Fort Point is not enjoyable for visitors who do not like dogs, and the preferred alternative would not change this area.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29312 (LE1100), Comment 193360

FP1300 - Fort Point: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29485

CONCERN STATEMENT: No Dog Area - It is difficult to have a no-dog experience at Fort Point, and the terrain of the trails may lead to unwanted interactions with dogs. Alternative D should be the preferred alternative at Fort Point.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208898 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Fort Point - This is one of several sites in San Francisco, as noted in the general comments, where we believe there is a decided lack of opportunity to have a "no dog" experience or to even avoid unwelcome approaches by dogs, given the narrowness of many of the trails. We support the Alternative D treatment ideally, or at least a reduction in the number of trails where dogs are permitted than shown in the preferred.

FP1400 - Fort Point: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29486

CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLAs - There should be more off-leash areas for dogs to run, particularly on the beach and on Fort Point trails.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3754 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204260 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Allow urbanized areas such as Ft Mason, Chrissy Field, and Fort Point as leash-free dog runs. Also, as a compromise, allow Fort Funston to continue to be essentially the dog run that it is (replete with untended feces) with the caveat that this does not include the lower beach area, only the upper iceplant

infested bluffs surrounding the parking lot. Otherwise, dogs have no business in the areas listed where seabirds forage, interact, and mate.

Concern ID: 29487

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters desired the preferred alternative, but only with the exclusion of commercial dog walking, a limit of one dog per visitor, the establishment of a easy system to report violations, and a requirement that compliance with the rules be at 95% or higher.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4410 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 206950 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Ft. Point 'We support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, one dog per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.
Corr. ID: 4584 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 210029 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Ft. Point ' I support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, one dog per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

FT1100 - Fort Miley: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29288

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenter supports the preferred alternative.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 10 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181428 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: the following are my comments on some of the various areas under review. Fort Miley: Alt C.

FT1200 - Fort Miley: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29289

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenter is opposed to changing the existing leash laws at this site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 548 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182016 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am opposed to the changes in leash laws pertaining to NPS lands in San Francisco.

FT1300 - Fort Miley: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29291

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenter supports alternative B (no dogs) and signage should be made available.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 71 **Organization:** none
Comment ID: 181826 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly believe that certain designated areas in GGNRA should exclude pets such as Fort Miley and huge swats of Ocean Beach. "No Pets" signs should be made visible and available for everyone to see including nighttime.

FT1400 - Fort Miley: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29292

CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA for Ft Miley and Lands End - A ROLA should be located along the Coastal Trail, Legion of Honor, El Camino del Mar Trail up to the steps, and between the golf course fence and bunkers.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2023 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193237 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -The coastal trail adjacent to Ft. Miley + the Legion of Honor needs to be a regulated offleash area.....

Corr. ID: 4354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 219011 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The El Camino del Mar Trail up to the steps has little space for dogs to run off on either side owing to density of habitat and steep topography. It seems appropriate for a regulated off-leash area (ROLA).

I prefer Alternative D because it also allows dogs off-leash in the very narrow strip of land between the golf course fence and the drop-off to the bunkers.

Note: Commenter is actually referring to Alternative E, not Alternative D.

Concern ID: 29293

CONCERN STATEMENT: On-Leash for Ft. Miley and Lands End - All the trails near the picnic tables and parking lots should be on-leash. Dogs should be on-leash along the Coastal Trail because it is steep and narrow. Trails missing from the maps from the golf course fence to the picnic tables and the El Camino del Mar Trail to the parking lot behind the Legion of Honor should also be on leash due to natural resources habitat.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209526 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: LANDS END/FORT MILEY

I favor Alternative D for this area. It has steep topography with narrow trail corridors in most places. It is appropriate to have dogs on leash on the Coastal Trail so that all visitors may have a good experience. The people who use the widest portion of this trail between Pt. Lobos Avenue and the end of the improved area are often older, disabled, or appear to be visitors from other countries.

Oddly, some trails are not shown on the maps, including one that connects the golf course fence line trail with the E. Ft. Miley picnic tables and one that continues the El Camino del Mar Trail past the steps to the parking lot behind the Legion of Honor. These areas have many opportunities for dogs to go off-trail into habitat areas. They should be on-leash areas. It should also be noted that the end of the fence line trail does not connect directly with the Legion of Honor parking lot and there is probably a 50' elevation difference between them. Walkers who try to connect in this area will be on San Francisco RPD land some of the time. Dogs should be on leash in all of these areas because of cars and museum visitors.

GA1000 - Impact Analysis: General Comment

Concern ID: 31873

CONCERN STATEMENT: Several impacts levels and other objectives require further definition and explanation to make them more measurable or clear.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4686 **Organization:** The Marin Humane Society

Comment ID: 210147 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: "Visitor Experience and Safety" ' The draft plan should clearly define what a "conflict" relating to dog use refers to.

"Law Enforcement/Compliance with Dog rules, and Park Operations"- The draft plan objective should further define what "maximizing dog walking compliance" refers to. This goal does not appear to be measurable and doesn't provide a process to determine enforcement success. A possible solution would be to clarify what the parameters will be to encourage high compliance or to incorporate envisioned compliance rates as an objective. Improved Park operations and use of staff resources managing dog walking seem to be different parameters. The draft plan should be very clear about what the enforcement goals are and assume that enforcement and staff resources are a part of daily park operations.

"Park Operations"- The draft plan should clearly state what and how the monitoring will be done by the Park. We would like to see this area further defined by clear objectives. The reference to monitoring to be used in future decision making based on estimated outcomes seems harsh and one-sided. This objective should be clearer. The draft plan should also address how it will evaluate commercial dog-walking and what that enforcement policy proposal will be.

"Natural Resources"- The draft plan should further define the objective of "protecting native wildlife and their habitat from detrimental effects of dog use..." Further, referring to detrimental effects of dog use doesn't adequately address what those issues include.

"Cultural Resources"- The draft plan should further define the meaning of "detrimental effects of dog use."

"Education" ' The draft plan should further define how to "build community support for the plan to maximize management of dog walking use."

GA2000 - Impact Analysis: Use Trends And Assumptions

Concern ID: 30514

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters have stated that the reasons for restricting/limiting/banning dogs at GGNRA are not realistic (such as dog attacks, dog walkers not picking up dog waste).

For representative quotes, please see Concern 30514 (GC1000), Representative Quote 181101.

Concern ID: 30515
CONCERN STATEMENT: The DEIS did not take into account the fact that some GGNRA sites are under-utilized (Fort Funston, Crissy Field) or utilized almost solely by dog walkers or mostly paved sites.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 373 **Organization:** Citizen, Property Owner & Tax Payer
Comment ID: 181156 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Currently there are limited off leash options in San Francisco.
 The proposals are huge reductions and specifically for the under utilized beaches at Fort Funston and Crissy Fields. Did the elaborate survey reflect actual daily users timelines? Mon-Fri? Sat? Sun? Foggy days? Windy days? Special events? There's very low usage Mon-Fri.

Concern ID: 30516
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree that allowing dogs at GGNRA makes more work for park employees.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 377 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 181165 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As to dogs making more work for park personell: I personally have never seen a dog rescue. There have been plenty of people rescues, however. Also, I have never, EVER seen a park ranger removing dog waste.

Concern ID: 30517
CONCERN STATEMENT: The DEIS assumes impacts result from dogs and the DEIS does not take into consideration other factors that impact the park's resources (humans, horses, bicyclists, waves, wind, erosion).
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 723 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 182749 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Included in the text of the report is a statement "that habitat loss and degradation due to development, beach recreation, and encroachment by non-native vegetation have contributed to a decline in Snow Plover numbers..... " That indicates to me that there are a broad number of factors that are at play here. The Graphical evidence provided in the report also provides no direct correlation that unleashed dogs and Snowy Plover numbers are related.....? It seems that information concerning exactly why numbers of native wildlife are falling is woefully inadequate. Until comprehensive studies are completed it would be premature to place all the blame on one potential disruption.
Corr. ID: 780 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 190024 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Claims of the snowy plover's demise being in any way tied to the activities of off-leash dogs are both disingenuous, spurious and completely overstated to say the least. It has long been settled that the compromised status of this species is attributable to anthropogenic habitat destruction. The widespread decimation of sand dunes, estuaries and other wetland systems (all of which are critical to the propagation of the snowy plover), represents the long established cause of the species' currently low population numbers.
Corr. ID: 2215 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 200764 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The GGNRA Dog Management Proposal is restricting

access to taxpaying citizens who own dogs for political reasons.

Dogs are not destroying the natural environment - people are - people who ride horses, ride bikes, hike etc.

Corr. ID: 2275 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201067 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The eco systems of our city beaches are essentially a redundancy and the wear and tear they are subjected to by dogs is not much different than the wear and tear by the weather, children and many adults. It is unrealistic to preserve these areas as museums. They are natural beaches closely connected to a crowded city and as residents of this area, people should be able to enjoy them as such either with or without their canines

Corr. ID: 4220 **Organization:** N/A

Comment ID: 208928 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We have looked at your documentation as it relates to dogs being off leash, and find that it is sorely lacking in most assumptions, and that if the assumptions were to be accurate, they would have considered the following as being problematic to the environment:

1. Beach Patrol Trucks driving into protected areas.
2. Horseback riding in protected areas (personal and police/ggnra).
3. Off road vehicles ridden by GGNRA staff.
4. Surfers walking through the dunes.
5. Runners, running through the dunes.
6. Off leash Children chasing birds/throwing stones.

Concern ID:

30518

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters disagree with assumptions in the DEIS concerning site usage (morning vs. evening usage) or visitation trends/rates at the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 822 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186101 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Most of the beach use studies I have noticed have taken place on weekends in the middle of the day. I am not confident the plan has an accurate beach use assessment. I am afraid that the beach use in the morning and evening is not well understood.

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192078 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Environmental Justice:

The DEIS states: "Some ethnic or low-income populations may be more negatively affected by off-leash dog walking."

Comment: The DEIS fails to characterize accurately the reasons for low visitation rates to national parks by minorities.. The DEIS should be changed to take into account the following:

- The problem of low visitation rates by ethnic and low- income populations to national parks has been identified in a number of studies. For a survey of the literature, see "Rocky Mountain National Park: History and Meanings as Constraints to African-American Park Visitation, 2001, Elizabeth B. Erickson." The DEIS should address the 1997 studies on low minority visitation to six national parks conducted by the NPS. Since these other parks are all subject to the very strict control of dogs by Park Service policy, dogs are NOT a factor in low visitation. To imply that dogs are the problem keeping away visitors from GGNRA

sites is not helping to deal with the real factors discouraging their presence. The DEIS should be revised to reflect the NPS data on low visitation by minorities to other national parks.

o Sources cited in support of DEIS statement include a phone survey by Northern Arizona University (NAU), as well as a small study done by San Francisco State (SFS).

Comment: The DEIS fails to characterize accurately the results of the NAU survey and the relevance of the SFS study, and the DEIS should be revised to reflect the following:

- On p. 1404 the DEIS, referring to the NAU survey, states: " 41% of those who had taken dogs for a walk at GGNRA were racial minorities"

The San Francisco State study was done with only 100 respondents and most were unfamiliar with GGNRA sites.

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192038

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: ii) The DEIS has no support for the statement about " increased public expectations for use of the park for dog recreation". The DEIS should be revised to remove that phrase based on the following:

- The DEIS states in the section on Visitation Trends, pp. 266-267 that the rate of visitation has been stable at approximately 14 million for the past thirty years and is expected to remain at that level for the next twenty years. The DEIS has no data about the number of dog visits per annum. Based on the stable rate of visitation and the absence of any data on dog visitation, the DEIS can not make the claim of increased public expectation.

Corr. ID: 1893

Organization: University of San Francisco

Comment ID: 200612

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: First, the justification for dog management plan is poorly thought out because impacts on the space and staffing are the result of multiple user groups. The background of your executive summary notes that use of the GGNRA has increased, as the population of the San Francisco Bay Area has increased. The background then goes on to cite an increase in the staff time required to manage dog-related issues and use this as justification for the dog management plan.

However, the problem with this argument is that if overall usage of the area has increased, you would expect a proportional increase in management of dogs, right along with a need for increased management of everything else- from parking to lost hikers. Why then is this proposal targeted at dogs, and not, say, bicyclists, whose use has presumably also increased? Or perhaps car-owners should be targeted, as parking can destroy habitat

Corr. ID: 4013

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206811

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a reader of the plan, I am confounded with the statements within the DDMP. If NPS acknowledges that the local population is increasing, and visitors to GGNRA is also increasing, how is the DDMP/NPS not predicting increased impacts on GGNRA resources? Even worse, how can they claim that new dog regulations need to be adopted, if park visitation is predicted to be fairly constant, and there will be no impacts on GGNRA resources.

Corr. ID: 4023

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206972

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Have you ever done a usage survey? In the areas I mention above and others, off-leash dog walking (and dog swimming) is the recreational usage for at least 50% of all visitors, probably more than that for some areas.

Corr. ID: 4091

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208391

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Visitor use - Our recommended alternative (Appendix A) is based on two facts, one of which is stated in the draft Plan/DEIS, and one of which is indirectly acknowledged but not analyzed in the draft Plan/DEIS.

The first fact is that visitor use has remained relatively stable for the past 20 years and is not projected to increase significantly in the next 20 years. Therefore, the CE EA remains a sound foundation for designating zones appropriate for off leash dog walking at Crissy Field.

Corr. ID: 4414

Organization: Paws in Motion/Marin Pet Care Association

Comment ID: 207121

Organization Type: Business

Representative Quote: Alternative A for Homestead Valley reports that the site has low visitor use. From my personal experience, this is incorrect. Dog owners living within walking distance or 5 minute driving distance (totaling approximately 30 or more residents) hike and run with their dogs all over the site, mostly off leash and have been doing so for many years.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

30519

Commenters do not agree with the general assumptions that blame dogs concerning dog waste and overstate the issue of dog bites.

Corr. ID: 1600

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 190836

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Ocean Beach restrictions seem a little unbalanced though. Many people who live in the Sunset will have nowhere to go. You should address the fact that people bother the snowy plovers just as much as on-leash dogs do. I don't remember this being analyzed in the alternatives.

Please also discuss how you can tell coliform bacteria tests can be attributable to dog waste only. If it cannot be distinguished from other animal waste, then it is not a cause effect.

Corr. ID: 4622

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 207075

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog Feces -

The users I have observed at Fort Funston have been quite proactive in collecting and disposing of dog feces. Although not mentioned in the DEIS, the NPS "poop patrol" collects the feces approximately every 1.5 - 2 hours from the various waste disposal sites. Therefore, the NPS must have records of the volume of dog feces which is collected and disposed of correctly. In addition there are volunteer clean up the entire area throughout the year programs. Those volunteers pick up all kinds of things from dog feces to litter in general.

Also, the "preferred alternative" will not change the amount of dog feces or make any change in the percentage of persons who comply with the feces pick-up requirements. Whether a dog in on leash or off leash will not change the amount of dog feces. There is no statistical data contained in the DEIS that there is any real

dog feces issue affecting Fort Funston.

Corr. ID: 4660 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227444 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In addition to these broad claims, Park Service cannot substantiate even the low number of incidents in the DEIS. Please see Appendix 3: e-mails Supporting Park Service Inability to Support DEIS Law Enforcement Counts in my public comment regarding Environmental Injustice. I attempted to verify the counts using the Ranger/USPP Details and the Ranger/USPP Headers and neither provided support for the dog "bite/attacks" counts, particularly the 17 reported for Stinson Beach in 2007 on page 272 of the DEIS. There is no evidence of any "bite/attacks" at Stinson Beach during 2007 or 2008, and yet this one DEIS number represents 32% of the total DEIS count (53) for all of 2007 and 2008 dog "bite/attacks". Overall, I was only able to find 51 incidents that seem to qualify as a "bite/attack" or hazardous condition versus the 119 shown in the DEIS. In addition, the DEIS shows that "bite/attack" and hazardous condition incidents dropped 45% from 77 in 2007 to 42 in 2008 without any apparent reason. I requested the schedule of the Ranger/USPP Details that substantiated the counts and was told there is no schedule, which indicates either a lack of professional care or deliberate manipulation of the data.

Corr. ID: 4660 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227443 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The 2001 to 2010 GGNRA Law Enforcement Records (Ranger/USPP Headers) list all of the reported incidents/offenses (incidents) with the ranger or USPP officer's brief description of the incident. The Ranger/USPP Headers do not indicate a significant number of safety-related incidents from dog recreation. I summarized and categorized the Ranger/USPP Headers, and found that between 1 and 2 percent of GGNRA safety-related incidents were dog-related. These incidents include incidents at all GGNRA sites not just the sites covered by the DEIS plan. These counts seem insignificant considering some 15% or 450,000 people in the Bay Area enjoy walking their dogs in the GGNRA (estimated from the 2002 Population Survey and 2008 US Census Report) and the nuisance type severity of most dog-related incidents. The level of severity for most other incidents is unclear from the Ranger/USPP Headers; however, it is reasonable to assume that the overall severity of other incident categories is much greater and include more life threatening injuries and even death.

Corr. ID: 4660 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227442 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Based on the 2007 and 2008 Ranger/USPP Details, I found the following accounts of actual human injuries and other animal and safety related incidents for the two years that should represent all of the "bite/attack" and hazardous condition incidents:

16 Trails/Beach Human with Injuries

2 non-owners that were nipped by OFF-leash dogs resulting in minor welts or scraps (1 jogger and 1 beach goer)

2 non-owners hikers that were nipped by ON-leash dogs resulting in minor welts or scraps
5 non-owners bumped either from OFF-leash playing dogs or dogs jumping up on them (3 children, 1 bicycle, and one adult on the beach)

5 dog owners with bite wound or lacerations from separating dogs with some requiring stitches

1 fisherman with a minor thumb puncture caused by a fish hook when baiting the line and a dog run into the fishing line

1 horse incidents with a rider thrown
1 NPS maintenance person that was bit on the knee and showed redness but no broken skin (unattended/tied up dog on a 20 foot lead)

3 Non-Trail/Beach Human Injuries

1 motorcyclists was injured from hitting a loose dog in traffic on Quarry Road
1 child was bite on the lip by a tied up dog at a business
1 skateboarder had a puncture wound/bruise on the arm from an on leash dog that lunged at a passing skateboard on the sidewalk

32 Other Animal and Safety Incidents

1 horse and buggy incident on the Ocean Beach with the horse having puncture bites on the nose
7 dog-dog interactions resulting in non-lethal injuries (1 grab/shake and 6 with scraps or lacerations)
1 dog cliff fall with serious injuries requiring aid being carried up from the beach (Fort Funston)
5 dog cliff rescues from dogs stranded on cliffs with no injuries (1 Sutro Baths, 1 Fort Point, 3 Fort Funston)
1 dog barking at a Park Service policeman on a horse
1 dog charging and grabbing the boot of a Park Service policeman (Illegal camping by a Washington resident with an outstanding warrant)
9 incidents of dog owners complaining about inappropriate dog-dog interactions (no injuries)
3 complaints about people not liking dog interactions (no physical contact with a dog)
4 stray dogs friendly dogs with no indication of aggressive or fearful behavior

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

30520

Commenters disagree with assumptions taken from the park's own data (LE data showing incidences and visitor use data) - regarding noncompliance or dog conflicts at the park.

Corr. ID: 1723

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191173

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am attaching an alternative for Fort Funston- Please consider this as a better policy - one that will work, with the least amount of frustration on your part and the part of dog walkers.

-Have a monthly clean-up day so the park at Fort Funston will not get "trashed" - as Superintendent Dean worried.

-Please consider that, although there are incidents of dog bites or fights - the number of dogs out there is great and the conflicts are few. No where in your report do you regard numbers of dogs visiting there parks per day

Corr. ID: 2003

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193207

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Page G-1 lists specific problems and # of occurrences. The numbers are extremely low compared to the number of visitors such as 15 wildlife disturbances.

Corr. ID: 2213

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200746 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I attended a recent open house hosted by GGNRA, and was told by one of the rangers that dog 'incidents' were one reason why they wanted to take away off-leash areas. However, this is not backed up by GGNRA's own statistics. Incidents involving dogs is extremely low, whereas incidents involving people (and no dogs) make up the majority of reports. Using the GGNRA's reasoning we should also ban people from these areas.

Corr. ID: 2899 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203051 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: "According to the GGNRA (GGNRA NPS Web Site, Park Facts, 2002), the parks had 13,994,614 "recreational visits" during FY 2001. Therefore, given there were 38 bites to bystanders in about 42,000,000 recreational visits to the GGNRA in the 3-year period, we can estimate the chance that a dog will bite a stranger at 1 in 1.1 million visits. (Compare this to the risk of being struck by lightning in the US - which is 1 in 250,000). A summary of the risk of being bitten by a dog in the GGNRA is given in Table 3.

Table 3: Risk of Dog Bite in the GGNRA

Type of Bite Risk*

Dog on Dog: 1 in 8,400,000

Dog on Owner or Friend: 1 in 1,105,263

Dog on Stranger: 1 in 1,135,135

* Based on GGNRA incident reports from 1999 to 2001 and 13,944,614 visits to the GGNRA per year

Corr. ID: 4622 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207048 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Safety -

The DEIS does not contain any user site survey of Fort Funston. NPS public spokesman Howard Levitt publicly stated in my presence at an NPS community meeting that no user site survey of Fort Funston has been conducted by, or on behalf of, the NPS. The DEIS repeatedly refers to safety issues related to dog bites. The only actual data in the DEIS pertaining to dog bites is the Law Enforcement Data (Appendix G) which reflects for Fort Funston "4 bite/attack" which is useless information without a site survey of users to determine if the reported incidents are statistically relevant. Nor does the data include a description of the severity of any incident (i.e., skin broken, medical attention required, etc.) The category "10 hazard/pet rescue" is noted to include "cases of simple assault, case of injured person, case threats" which appear to include actions of persons, not dogs. What exactly is being reported? Such a broad sweeping reference without inclusive analysis is legally meaningless and appears to be puffery by NPS. In fact, the entire report is replete with adjectives and adverbs but without meaningful data. One could say that the entire compilation reads like a conclusion was reached and staff was then directed to support it. Interesting. There simply is no statistical data as to the daily number of visitors, the daily number of dogs, and what the Fort Funston visitors are or are not doing (i.e., walking dogs, walking, hang gliding, flying radio controlled airplanes, practicing cliff rescue, watching the ocean, etc.) While I have not done a survey, I would be willing to state that the categories just listed cover 90+% of those who visit Fort Funston.

The DEIS does not include any discussion of the inherent danger of the beach at Fort Funston due to the extreme undertow and riptide conditions present throughout the year. All native San Franciscans understand the very significant danger presented at this stretch of coastline. Any use of the beach should, for public safety,

be restricted from swimming.

Concern ID: 30521
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters question the assumption that some visitors experience incidents with dogs and do not report the incidents, when this is an actual fact.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4070 **Organization:** Mar Vista Stables
Comment ID: 207714 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 18)Page 286 "It is also assumed that the large percentage of visitors that experience incidents with dogs do not report them to park staff (Coast, pers. Comm., 2006)" This is a FACT?it should not just be an assumption. I have ridden horses on the beach below Fort Funston for over 10 years. There has not been ONE ride where an offleash dog has not chased after my horse. That being said, they usually turn around or stop after a while, but these are all incidents that harass/ annoy/ or effect the visitor experience of another user of the public land. I do not call the park service every time this occurs because I have a VERY seasoned horse and am used to handling the situation, but it should be noted that the events do occur on a regular basis and they are non-stop under current management.

Concern ID: 30522
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters question the assumption that elder visitors or visitors who are minorities are afraid of dogs.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4224 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 208968 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 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 don't come to the GGNRA because of the dogs. DEIS did not consider negative impacts on minorities and disabled who lose access to dog walking.
Corr. ID: 4371 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 209515 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The GGNRA has not fully considered urban impact (city parks, area resources), human impact (physical, mental, social) and it grossly believes the DEIS and The Plan will better serve minorities (minorities fear dogs).

Concern ID: 30523
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters note that an assessment of visitor experience should not assume that people without dogs do not enjoy dogs, but that some visitors (without dogs) are either neutral or accepting towards other people's dogs.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4560 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 209896 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The DEIS focuses on visitors who do not want to be around off-leash dogs. First, there are many places where people can go if they do not want to encounter off-leash dogs, far, far more than the number of places that allow off-leash dogs. Second, consideration should also be given to people without dogs who are either neutral or positive toward encountering dogs in the parks.

I encounter non-dog owners on my walks all the time who clearly enjoy interacting with dogs and in fact many times I've had people come up and ask me if they can pet my dog. Many tell me that they love dogs or their kids love dogs, but they

cannot have one of their own, and they therefore love come to places like Fort Funston to interact with them. Any assessment of visitor experience must include non dog owners who are neutral or positively inclined toward being around off-leash dogs.

Concern ID: 30524
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree with assumptions made at certain park sites (such as the vandalism at Crissy Field is a result of dog walkers).
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4016 **Organization:** San Francisco resident
Comment ID: 206837 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: - In referencing Chrissy Field, the DEIS states that "vandalism" is regularly occurring at this site. I find it difficult to believe that this "vandalism" should be attributed solely to dog-walking users of this site.

GA3000 - Impact Analysis: General Methodology For Establishing Impacts/Effects

Concern ID: 30091
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree with the impacts analysis of the DEIS because there is not any or enough scientific evidence to support restricting/limiting/banning dogs at GGNRA sites; some commenters believe the DEIS is biased against dogs or there are too many cases of "could," "may," "might" occur in the impacts analysis (speculation), thus proving little evidence of actual impacts from dogs documented at the sites.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 129 **Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog
Comment ID: 182225 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am writing to object to the proposed 2011 Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA. In my view, the GGNRA has not gathered enough evidence of any sort to justify banning/restricting dogs from the GGNRA lands. Your science advanced is weak, and few surveys indicate that the majority of park users see any need for change.
Corr. ID: 936 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 191419 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I believe that there is no factual basis for the argument that birds and other wild animals need to be protected from off-leash dogs. There seems to be no scientific consensus that severe restrictions on off-leash dogs are needed to protect natural resources and wildlife. Some of the most compelling research in the last few years has been by researchers such as Forrest and Cassidy St. Clair (2006) and Warren (2007) who admit that they expected to find that off-leash dogs had a major impact on the diversity, abundance, and feeding behaviors of birds and small mammals. However, when they did the actual research, they found no such impact.
Corr. ID: 941 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 191440 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Most disturbing is that there is no scientific environmental argument for these punitive restrictions (by the way I am a PhD level educated scientist from an Ivy League Graduate school). Although marketed as an "environmental" impact report, in most cases there are no good environmental arguments for restricting dog access.
Corr. ID: 1007 **Organization:** Odie's Mom
Comment ID: 191741 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It also strikes me as odd that this is the fight the GGNRA wants to take up when there is no research to support the suggestion there has been ecological impact over the past 30 years of the use of the lands for dog walking.

Corr. ID: 1257 **Organization:** Montara Dogs

Comment ID: 194952 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: No scientific studies were done on this land to conclude that banning dogs is necessary.

Corr. ID: 1833 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191970 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) The conclusions are simply not supported by the alleged "facts" that claim to support them. The Statement suffers from expectancy bias. Expectancy bias is where a researcher expects a given result, and then manipulates, cherry-picks and/or misinterprets facts and data in order to reach the given result. This is simply bad science, and the opposite of what the scientific method requires, and

Corr. ID: 3737 **Organization:** SF Dog Owners Group

Comment ID: 204252 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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 don't exist. I have never seen dogs causing major problems, not attacking people or bothering bank swallows or snowy plovers at Fort Funston.

Corr. ID: 3737 **Organization:** SF Dog Owners Group

Comment ID: 204240 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I want a dog management plan based on real science, not pre-determined biased obscure observations with guessed at causes and outcomes. The DEIS fails to document actual impacts on resources at each site. DEIS assumes that if an impact "could" occur, it does occur at each site, even though there is little evidence of actual impacts documented at each site. If the DEIS cannot document actual impacts, then they cannot restrict access.

Corr. ID: 4451 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208404 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Let's take page 14, Chapter 1, "Purpose and Need for Action" as an example. Under "Water Quality" we see three issues raised (italics Mine):

- "Issue: dogs playing in streams, wetlands, lagoons and coastal areas can increase turbidity..." The study doesn't say they DO increase turbidity, doesn't prove or even try to prove they do increase turbidity, or that the negative outcomes outlined in this Issue point are realistic outcomes.

- "Issue: Dog waste can increase nutrient levels..." Again, no site-specific proof, no backup, just a "maybe" with a lot of "maybe" negative effects. Without site-specific proof, this is not acceptable as a part of an EIS, since it is not based on science or proof, only conjecture.

- "Issue: Domestic dogs can potentially introduce diseases..." This is yet-another example of a "maybe" that is not studied, not backed up with hard site-specific facts. It's a conjecture in lieu of a substantiated-reason for limiting dog access. Or, let's look at the "Wildlife" issue, page 15 (italics mine): "Issue: Intensive dog use of an area could disrupt its wildlife..."

"Issue: Dog play can trample vegetation..."

"Issue: Dogs or dog waste can infect wildlife..."

"Issue: Habitat for all wildlife... may be affected by dog use..."

Again, all conjecture about what might happen, without site-specific study or facts to prove that these problems are happening in the GGNRA due to dog use.

This untested, unproven conjecture continues throughout the "CURRENT DOG MANAGEMENT ISSUES AND IMPACT TOPICS" section, which is a huge basis for the change in dog policy. It's bad science, and makes for an incomplete and biased environmental impact study. Since the study BEGINS with faulty assumptions, the entire 1,500 plus pages of the study, including its conclusions, becomes meaningless

Corr. ID: 4712 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209785 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Inherent NPS bias: NPS Director Jarvis' public statements about GGNRA Dog issues, GGNRA staff bias for this issue.

As NPS' Western Regional Director, this is a direct quote from Mr. Jarvis as reported by Suzanne Valente and Steve Golumb when they asked Mr. Jarvis about possible City Of San Francisco reversion at Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. This conversation took place outside of the NPS Centennial-Initiative Listening Session, Presidio Officer's Club, San Francisco, Ca., March 22, 2007

"I would rather give up those [the GGNRA] properties than have dogs running loose on them." March 22, 2007

KQED Forum Show, April 7, 2011, <http://www.kqed.org/a/forum/R201104070900>
2007 GGNRAJGGNPC Intercept Survey

Concern ID: 30092

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters question the lack of monitoring/sampling/survey/usage statistics or site-specific data studies to support the DEIS, or suggests that data be collected.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 918 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191334 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preferred alternative purports to restore Fort Funston to a natural wild state. Even if this is possible, it will take many years. And even if it happens, how many people will be served in a Recreational manner by the Preferred Alternative? What surveys and data has the Park Service relied on in estimating this number of people? This data must be made publicly available for review. If the Preferred Alternative cannot clearly and scientifically be demonstrated to result in serving a greater number of people, it should be replaced entirely. The status quo should be the Preferred Alternative.

Corr. ID: 1484 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191261 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Despite the length of your report, I do not see evidence of baseline surveys or control groups or any of the usual criteria used in scientific studies. And yet you demand that we be "specific" in our comments!

It is unrealistic to expect urban parks to be completely wild or 'natural' Even if pets were banned, would you not have some concerns with feral cats, raccoons, etc.?

You claim that dogs can frighten the snowy plover. I suppose people could frighten them also. Is the next step to ban people from walking through Fort Funston?

Incidentally, have never seen any of my dogs at Fort Funston or at Ocean Beach harm a bird. Nor do they trample over any fence-protected plants.

Corr. ID: 1576 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190791 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Is there adequate scientific evidence that dogs are the problem? Perhaps the National Parks could do a "clinical" trial as we do in medicine, implementing their intervention @ certain areas + then have other areas remain the same (placebo group). This trial could be done over 3-5 years period and then the outcomes could be compared (some member of wildlife preservation). If this data is already published or known it should be displayed. Either way it is good science and would go along way with the citizens of San Francisco.

Corr. ID: 1954 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192705 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -Want more studies (in addition to Northern Arizona University study) SF state study about dogs & GGNRA user's coexistence

Corr. ID: 3347 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203035 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a resident of San Francisco for the past 32 years, and a dog owner for the past 25 years, I depend on open areas to exercise my dog. I visit the GGNRA every day, sometimes without, but mostly with, my dog. Like most, and perhaps nearly all, San Francisco residents, I don't have a yard in which to exercise my dog. I rely on dog-friendly open areas where I can exercise my dog off leash. Like the vast majority of dog owners, I am a responsible owner: I leash my dog in areas dense with people, in sensitive habitats off limits to pets, and in areas posted on-leash only. I don't let him dig or chase wildlife. I clean up my dog's stool, and even the stool that other, less responsible pet owners, leave behind. My dog needs more exercise than my old legs could ever possibly give him. He needs to run around, chase balls and play with other dogs, and he can't do this on a leash. Dogs that don't socialize off leash with other dogs develop aggressive, anti-social behaviors that make them a nuisance, and can even make them dangerous when they are allowed off leash.

The GGNRA 1979 Pet Policy has served the GGNRA and Bay Area pet owners well for over 40 years. It recognizes that pet owner recreation includes dogs, and imposes sensible restrictions on pets and their owners. It recognizes that the GGNRA must serve the needs of an urban population. The GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement provides no evidence that the 1979 Pet Policy has had any material adverse impact on wild species or the natural environment in the GGNRA. If dog access is to be severely restricted as proposed, the damage dogs might do to the park in the future must be supported by the damage that they have done in the past. To arbitrarily change these rules and ignore 40 years of data is irresponsible. And if no data was collected during this period to justify the proposed changes, then a period of time should be allowed to collect data relevant to the proposed changes so that the policy is based on good science, not hypothetical future events.

Corr. ID: 3781 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205167 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS does not present any original, long term research results conducted on GGNRA lands that demonstrates that people with dogs have a deleterious affect upon plants and wildlife more than expected of visitors without dogs. The use of the word "Could" is used many times in the DEIS. Dogs "could" stir silt up, "could" harass wildlife, etc, instead of attempting to study actions of visitors and reporting statistics of actual use, misuse, and its effects.

Corr. ID: 4055 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207514 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The report appears to make no attempt to analyse the relative usage of each of the areas by category, i.e dog and non-dog and the impact on the area outside of the GGNRA if the dog users are excluded and/or constrained by the changes proposed. e.g, by simple estimation the majority of usage in ft funston is dog walking, yet no statistical analysis has been preformed and no subsequent analysis of the impact of the changes proposed.

This appears to be a bias fundamental in the intent of the report, only the 'environmental' impact has been considered

Additionally no historic statistics have been presented to support any unacceptable increase in dog related 'issues' the report is purely speculative in this regard. This appears to be another biased omission intent in avoiding real analysis, and replacing it with 'opinion' unsubstantiated by fact.

Corr. ID: 4060

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207606

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A critical oversight in the GGNRA's assessment was their decision to use a literature search and not real time water and soil sample analysis on which to base their decision. This means there was no actual testing of soil or water quality over a period of time during which dogs were present on the open space in question--instead the GGNRA used case studies from other sites with similar characteristics on which to make their determination.

Bad science makes for bad decisions and misleading data. Bay area dog owners deserve much better--

Corr. ID: 4405

Organization: Montara Dog Walking Group

Comment ID: 204921

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The rational provided in the DEIS to allow for a change in the current 1979 Pet Policy areas (plus the San Mateo County GGNRA) does not appear to be based on sound science and long-term monitoring of site specific conditions. Many statements seem to be opinion vs fact based from actual impact studies.

Corr. ID: 4614

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210137

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS claims that off leash dogs are interfering with the nest of the Bank Swallows which are located on the cliffs at the beach. While every once in a while an errant dog falls over the cliffs by accident, this is unusual experience and not done to interfere with a bird. People climb the cliffs and also fall over them but the DEIS does not include any analysis of the effect of the human interference with Bank Swallows or other native inhabitants. In addition, no statistical data is provided pertaining to the large number of cliff rescues by the Police, Sheriff, Fire Department, Coast Guard. There must be data available because the various departments are frequently present on site practicing and / or rescuing.

Concern ID:

30093

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters request that statements made in the document should be backed up by adequate references or questions why studies that have not been peer-reviewed are included in the analysis.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3789

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205542

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I read much of the Dog Management Plan Draft EIS and, beyond my disagreement with the proposals provided in the document, I was

incredibly disappointed by the quality of the document. Generally speaking, I had four major concerns:

1. There was a woeful lack of substantiation (scientific evidence or other documentation) to many claims made in the document. The document needs to be carefully reviewed and revised to ensure all statements are backed up by adequate references, or else that the statements in the document are revised.

Corr. ID: 4013 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206796 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In fact, several of the cited works don't accurately describe the data & the areas of study in the context of a dog or general EIS within the GGNRA. One of many examples can be found in pg.225 of the DDMP regarding "Alterations of Park Soils". The citation -Joslin and Youmans 1999, 9.3- is taken from a review from Montana Chapter of the Wilderness Society. Naturally, the review focuses on the subject of land policy more accurately described as Montana wilderness. But more importantly the citation actually does not include any actual data - just a page & chapter in a review upon which the authors (Joslin/Youmans) cite other works. Even worse, the work was not published in a peer-reviewed journal.

Concern ID: 30094

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters do not agree with the impacts analysis of the DEIS because the reports used to determine impacts are not acceptable (telephone survey - small study size), not applicable (studies not done in urban areas) or based upon speculation and not data/fact/evidence (Hatch 2006 bank swallow report, Hatch 1999 report).

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1580 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190802 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) "Scientific" reports which are used to base a decision require a peer-review, per NPS Guidelines of Scientific Conduct. Daphne Hatch's Bank Swallow report 2006 makes conclusions which are not based on her data. She makes speculative statements about what dogs could do, but there is no evidence for damage, e.g., digging which leads to burrow collapse.

Corr. ID: 1694 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191104 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 6) Lots of the data and studies faulty: Norther Arizona University and SF State data about minorities fear of dogs in parks. Do better studies with larger pools of respondents.

Corr. ID: 1802 **Organization:** Fort Funston Dog Walkers

Comment ID: 191635 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The telephone survey on page 99 was statistically useless. 1700 calls is way too small and how do you know they even visit these places. There are more people on a sunny weekend at F.F. than you have talked to.

Corr. ID: 1803 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191655 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS continues a trend of GGNRA claims about impacts by dogs on birds that are not supported by the data. It is based on bad science. There is no scientific consensus that severe restrictions on off-leash clogs are needed to protect natural resources and wildlife. Some of the most compelling research in the last few years has been by researchers such as Forrest and Cassidy St. Clair (2006) and Warren (2007) who admit that they expected to find that off-leash dogs had a major impact on the diversity, abundance, and feeding behaviors of birds and small mammals. However, when they did the actual research, they found

no such impacts. This indicates that assumptions about impacts from off-leash dogs must be tested and proven to be true before they can be used to justify restrictions. Unfortunately, most of the assumptions cited by the GGNRA have not been adequately tested or proven.

Severe restrictions are not needed to protect the snowy plover. The GGNRA's own data show that off-leash dogs have no impact on the numbers of snowy plovers, a threatened species that roosts only (does not nest or raise chicks) on relatively small parts of Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. Indeed, larger numbers of snowy plovers frequently coincided with times when dogs were allowed off-leash in the area. The 1999 Hatch Report observed 5,692 dogs at Ocean Beach and found that only 6% chased birds (mostly seagulls). Indeed, of these 5,692 dogs, a mere 19 were observed to chase plovers. That is one-third of 1% of the dogs observed. Target those dog owners for enforcement, but leave the other 99.66% of dogs that did not chase plovers alone.

Corr. ID: 1981

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193157

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Why are the studies regarding dog behavior & impact in other areas of the country being used as a basis for this proposal?

Who has reviewed the validity & credibility of the research cited in this study. Is it really applicable to this urban recreation area?

Corr. ID: 4013

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206797

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A second example citing data from a study that intentionally manipulates readers toward a misleading & biased conclusion can be found on page 227. The cited study (USGS 2008, 12) refers to a USGS survey measuring baseline pesticides concentrations at 10 creek sites - some of them located within the GGNRA. The data collected from this single study was no doubt an important first step "provide baseline information to enable evaluation of the need for future monitoring". But there is no data or method in this report to connect the low levels of Fipronil observed to any activity of dogs or dog owners in the area. So it begs the question, why is it in the DDMP?

Corr. ID: 4021

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206897

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 4) People without dogs pose an equal "risk" to plovers, yet there is no attempt to restrict their access to the plover areas.

Unable to prove any impact on plover population numbers, the 1996 Hatch Report argued that dogs "disturb" plovers. However in the entire 1.5-year study, only 19 out of 5,692 dogs -- less than one-third of one percent -- were observed deliberately chasing plovers, and none was reported to actually catch or harm a bird. The report adds that on another 15 occasions, at least 100 additional plovers were "inadvertently disturbed" by dogs, comparing this to the 48 plovers inadvertently disturbed by people without dogs, implying dogs inadvertently disturb plovers at least twice as often as people alone. But a closer reading of the report shows that the disturbances from people were noted in about half the recording time (24 hours of observations) as that devoted to studying dogs (40 hours). Had the two groups been observed for equal amounts of time, the number of disturbances would have been nearly the same.

Corr. ID: 4064

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207624

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS provides no site-specific studies or evidence to support its strongly stated conclusion that allowing dogs access to limited areas on

the GGNRA results in a negative impact on those areas.

The studies that are referenced in the document are often decades old and are based on research done in places as removed from the GGNRA as Virginia or Colorado. Additionally, these studies present contradictory conclusions about the severity of impacts due to dogs. The final conclusions of the DEIS claim studies prove that dogs have a significant negative impact of the environment, but the Boulder, CO study referenced in the document demonstrates that off-leash dogs did not travel far off-trail and rarely disturbed other people, wildlife, vegetation, or bodies of water. Another study states that dogs traveling on a trail with screening vegetation are unlikely to even encounter, let alone disturb, wildlife. Water quality sampling in the GGNRA at some sites that are currently accessible to dogs has shown that "the quality of water bodies throughout the park is generally acceptable for sustaining aquatic life." The DEIS cites the Crissy Field tidal marsh as a particularly healthy body of water, even though Crissy Field is a widely used off-leash dog recreation area. These conflicting data should put the conclusions in the DEIS about dog impacts into doubt, but instead the document clearly treats them as indisputable fact.

Concern ID:

30095

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters do not agree with the impacts analysis of the DEIS because it does not reflect the findings of other studies (that have shown dogs do not impact or are not the only impact to wildlife/resources, etc as in Hatch 1996) or important studies were not included in the analysis (GGNRA Site Stewardship use patterns survey, Nola Chow study, Forrest Cassidy/St. Clair/Warren study of snowy plover) or some studies were not emphasized enough (Lafferty studies).

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 624

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 182744

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: After reading about the proposed plan, I developed many concerns about the way in which the document was written and the information on which its conclusions are based as well as the potential ramifications of its implementation. Specifically, the document's suggestions for alternative locations for off-leash dog-walking suggests the authors did not fully research alternative locations as some suggested locations are currently not designated off-leash areas. Further, the cited scientific research does not consider numerous additional studies that reached dramatically different conclusions about the impact of off-leash dogs on the environment.

Corr. ID: 1507

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 191408

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe that there is no factual basis for the argument that birds and other wild animals need to be protected from off-leash dogs. There seems to be no scientific consensus that severe restrictions on off-leash dogs are needed to protect natural resources and wildlife. Some of the most compelling research in the last few years has been by researchers such as Forrest and Cassidy St. Clair (2006) and Warren (2007) who admit that they expected to find that off-leash dogs had a major impact on the diversity, abundance, and feeding behaviors of birds and small mammals. However, when they did the actual research, they found no such impact.

Corr. ID: 1512

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 191449

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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?

Corr. ID: 1529 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190697 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The draft environmental impact study draws conclusions from little or contradictory information. For example, one study of the impact of dogs off leash in urban parks show no decrease in bird diversity, but the EIS concludes a negative impact.

Contrary to the gold standard of Adaptive Resource Management, the plan only proposes to collect data on dog compliance, ignoring the issues that are the goals of the plan such as the environmental impact of the changes

Corr. ID: 1929 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192267 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: OB/CF: Why wasn't the Warren study (2007) on WSP included in DEIS analysis? Funston: Bank swallows burrows/nest cannot be accessed by dogs. They are in the cliff face behind the faux emergency closure.

Corr. ID: 3068 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203065 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Further, the studies/science utilized to support allegations of damage to resources in the GGNRA are fatally flawed - the positive impacts are ignored and the negative impacts are unverified. For example, this DEIS omits the Warren study of the snowy plover which concluded recreation of dogs and their owners does not negatively affect the feeding of the plover

Corr. ID: 4013 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206806 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DDMP claims that "Both on- and off-leash dogs are routinely brought into the WPA by park visitors, and are the greatest source of disturbance to western snowy plovers (Zlatunich 2009, 10)". Data presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7 from Zlatunich 2009 clearly provides evidence contrary to the DDMP statement. In the 11 hours of survey time (time with plovers present) reported in the Zlatunich study (conducted at Crissy field), there were 14 recorded incidents of WSP disturbances (Table 6). 79% (11/14) of these disturbances were caused by human walkers and runners. In addition, the number of humans within the 11 hrs of survey (time with plovers present) numbered 398 vs 58 dogs (18 on leash/ 40 off-leash) - a ratio of nearly 7 to 1. The data presented clearly shows that a large numbers of recreational humans are involved with the majority of WSP disturbances. In fact, only 1 of the reported 14 disturbances came from off-leash dogs. Table 7 reports a disturbance rate of 2.5% for off-leash dogs as compared with 3.6 % to walkers and 5.9% for joggers

Corr. ID: 4021 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206889 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2) The GGNRA's own studies indicate that dogs have no significant negative impact on the population of snowy plovers at Ocean Beach, The Nov 15, 1996 report of snowy plovers by GGNRA staffer Daphne Hatch found that there was an increase of more than 100% in the number of snowy plovers in the years after the 1979 Pet Policy went into effect (allowing offleash dogs on Ocean Beach and elsewhere). There was no negative relationship between the number of dogs and the numbers of plovers on the beach at the same time. Indeed, the 1996 Hatch Report says: "Factors other than the number of people or dogs, possibly beach slope and width, appear to exert greater influence over Snowy Plover numbers on Ocean Beach."

Corr. ID: 4021

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206901

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 5) The Federal Government cannot make policy decisions (such as this proposed closure) that are based on assumptions that have no hard data to back them up.

The assumption that any disturbance of plovers or other shorebirds causes significant problems for the birds is repeatedly stated as fact. However, even the 1996 Hatch Report says that "Little research has been conducted on the energetic effects of disturbances, and on whether individuals can compensate for this lost energy intake and increased energy expenditure." One recent study, conducted as part of a Senior Research Seminar at UC Berkeley did test the commonly repeated assumption that recreational disturbances changed the feeding behavior of snowy plovers. Megan Warren (2007) found no significant relationship between feeding behavior and direct disturbance by people recreating on the beach.

Corr. ID: 4218

Organization: Save Off Leash, SFDog, Sierra Club, Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 208913

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I was working as a volunteer for Site Stewardship at the time, after my CCC day job. I designed and organized a study at Milagra Ridge on public use patterns in conjunction with staff at Site Stewardship. We'd mainly seen dog-walkers, cyclists, kite flyers, and birders up there, and wanted to quantify it for some upcoming trail planning. Staff members, volunteers, and I took turns watching people walk the trails. We made sure we had people of differing opinions about dogs and bikers, so that we wouldn't be biased.

We measured, among other things: 1) which trails people used, 2) whether they had dogs, 3) how many dogs and people there were in a group, and 4) how far off the trail dogs went. We found that most people who were there with dogs were walking "off-leash", but their dogs were staying close by. We also estimated that about 90% of dogs stayed within about 10 feet of the trail.

Concern ID:

30096

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters state that that baseline for comparison in the DEIS should be an environment in which the impact of dogs is added to the impact of humans; or commenters do not agree with the baseline for comparison presented in the DEIS.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1562

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190764

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The current regulations are not enforced. In areas like Ft. Funston and its trails it would be beneficial to publish and post the regulations so they can be enforced prior to modifying the existing usage situation. Given the driver for the issues is heavily dependent on potential interactions between people and offleash dogs - you do not have a valid baseline on the issues until enforcement is in place. As a result making a change is premature.

Corr. ID: 4010

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206767

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: All human activities (and all activities by other species) impact other components of the ecosystem. This does not mean that we will, as a society, treat all disturbance as acceptable. However, it provides a more honest reference point for discourse about acceptability. I request that the NPS document the historic range of variability, using pre-white settlement as a reference point, for the species discussed in the DEIS. In addition, I request that the NPS document the effect on those species of humans other than those recreating with dogs. This includes the effect of NPS actions. This provides an important context for

discussions of the impact of people recreating with dogs

Corr. ID: 4038 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207208 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA should modify its compliance-based approach to create a baseline of current conditions and then measure impacts against compliance. Based on my considerable experience at Crissy Field, I am highly confident the GGNRA would learn that the so-called bases or justifications for the alternatives -- at least at Crissy Field -- have no validity. Indeed, many of the purported justifications for the restrictions are couched in "could's" rather than what has actually happened. The text of the DEIS demonstrates that there is no basis in history or fact for prohibiting off-leash dogs at the East Beach, the promenade, and the adjacent areas.

Concern ID: 30168

CONCERN STATEMENT: [In general, commenters do not agree that dogs have an impact on the resources at GGNRA and/or the case is not substantiated with logic clearly in the DEIS that dogs impact resources.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 350 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181125 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As dog owner, I often walk my dog in the areas under study and have never witnessed any problems except park police warning and ticketing dogs just for being off lead, not because they were being a nuisance or danger.

I would like assurance that the GGNRA is not pursuing the extensive limitations they propose for a non-existent problem.

Corr. ID: 888 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190052 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This effort by NPS is extremely disturbing and a waste of taxpayer money. I hike on park service trails all of the time and have never seen an issue with dogs on leash or off leash. This is not a significant problem.

Corr. ID: 1595 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190827 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I discovered Ft. Funston 3 years ago when I first received out dog and have been going there every week since. From the beginning, I was amazed at how responsible the majority of dog owners are at cleaning up after their dogs. I see NO adverse affects from the dogs at this location. What I see is a vibrant community of dog owners who travel from all over to enjoy one of our last resources available to let our dogs run off leash.

Corr. ID: 1715 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191157 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) Chapter 3 table 6 stated only 3 incidents @ Muir Beach. Yet you're closing the beach. Seems to me that the environmental impacts reported do not substantiate the recommend proposal.

(1a) Muir Beach has fewer incidents than Stinson yet is more restrictive. Don't understand logic

Corr. ID: 3762 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204662 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very familiar with your proposal and am extremely opposed to it. The GGNRA was established as a recreation area. Your report barely makes reference to that use. As someone extremely familiar with all the local GGRA in which dogs are allowed, I find little evidence that dogs have any

significant impact on the native animal nor plant environment. I believe that dogs have less of a negative impact than certainly people-as well as other recreational users. But not only has my personal observation supported that-more importantly the GGNRA's proposal cites reasons for the severe limitations of dogs-both on-leash and off-leash-are NOT supported by scientific evidence

Corr. ID: 3789

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205543

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2. The authors of the document clearly did not have a good grasp on the experience of local residents using the GGNRA, or give the reader much context of the dense urban setting that surround the GGNRA. The document should be revised to include the experiences of local residents as well as much better characterization of the local setting (i.e. the urban environment). In my personal experience in the areas that I visit almost daily in the GGNRA, conflicts with dogs very rarely occur, dog walkers are extremely respectful, and dogs are generally very well behaved. While incidents may occasionally occur (though I have never witnessed an incident in my many years of visiting the park), there is no clear evidence presented in the document of a major issue

Corr. ID: 4064

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207631

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS describes the many at-risk species that can be found in the GGNRA and justifiably states that the GGNRA lands contain important, biodiverse communities. The DEIS does not, however, provide clear documentation of the overlap of most of these species with areas currently accessible to dogs. Under current regulations, less than 1% of the GGNRA is accessible to dogs, and the DEIS does not prove that this small amount of land has a detrimental effect on the overall populations of these at-risk species. In cases like the snowy plover where there are clearer data, the DEIS again does not distinguish between the impact of the presence of dogs, on- or off-leash, and the presence of humans in the birds' habitat.

Corr. ID: 4678

Organization: Ocean Beach Dog

Comment ID: 227538

Organization Type: Civic Groups

Representative Quote: Design: 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. However, it could have been undertaken at any time. A comparative study is designed to remove one variable in a situation at a time, and observe the change, if any. An initial period of observation would document the presence of predators (ravens) and their numbers, as well as the frequency of harassment/disturbance from all sources absent any management action. Next, the predators (ravens) being the most serious source of potential disturbance/harassment are removed as much as possible.

Concern ID:

30173

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The parks own data (LE data and visitor use data) does not support restricting/limiting/banning dogs at GGNRA sites because the data do not present a real issue or the issues are very small as a result of dogs at the park.

Representative Quote(s):**Corr. ID:** 1510**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 191427**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Your own data do not support your claim that off leash dogs represent a safety concern and are a threat to non-dog people. From 2001-2006, the latest years for which data is available, there were only a total of 2,865 pet-related incidents recorded by the GGNRA; this is out of 226 MILLION dog visits during the same period. Clearly either dogs are not a problem or you are unable to enforce existing laws.

Corr. ID: 1850**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 192040**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: iii)The DEIS provides no support for a significant impact on visitor and employee safety from dog walking as indicated by the following:
- An extremely small amount of Law Enforcement (LE) time is currently devoted to dog management issues. The DEIS states (p. 283)that "Approximately 1 percent of LE (law enforcement) time is devoted to dog management- related issues." If dog walking is such a major issue for visitor and employee safety as suggested in the Need for Action, why is law enforcement only spending one percent of its time on dog management issues?

To illustrate effort devoted by LE to pet related issues, the DEIS provides statistics on incidents and case reports related to dogs and visitors during 2007-2008 in table 9 provided in Appendix G. The data in this table reflect the heavy emphasis on leash law enforcement with over 70% of the 2,424 incidents defined as a leash law violation. In contrast, only 9% of the incidents reflected violations for serious infractions such as dog attacks/bites (2%), disturbing wildlife (2%), and hazardous conditions/pet rescue (5 %). Moreover, over one third of the incidents recorded in Table 9 were based on reports from the public, not on incidents where park service personnel were present at the time of the alleged violation. With only 1% of LE time devoted to dog management issues and with 70% of that time devoted to leash law violations, the portion of LE time devoted to health and safety issues for visitors and and employees related to dogs (as well as wildlife disturbance) is less than three tenths of one percent.

Corr. ID: 3120**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 203753**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am extraordinarily disappointed with NPS proposed preferred alternative for the Golden Gate Parks National Recreation Area's dog policy.

The DEIS treats recreation in GGNRA as an adverse impact, despite the fact that GGNRA is a mandated recreation area, and not exclusively for conservation. DEIS must include an evaluation of the benefits of recreation.

The NPS' DEIS frequently misrepresents proven science in pursuit of its over-broad regulatory agenda. For example, the DEIS frequently cites potential problems with off-leash dogs that "could" or "might" happen - even though there are no document examples of these issues in the 30+ years of the existing off-leash rules. Claims of impacts on bank swallows are unsubstantiated, and in fact run counter to 1996 GGNRA findings by Nola Chow that dogs do not impact the swallows (for reasons unclear, this particular report was excluded from the DEIS). The DEIS asserting that off-leash dogs represent a safety issue is woefully unsubstantiated. According to the official incident reports on file with GGNRA, less than 2% of reported safety and security issues in GGNRA are dog related, averaging 2 incidents per 1.3 million

visits. But with 98% of security and safety issues coming as a result of human behavior, off-leash dogs are not the issue NPS needs to focus its resources on to make visiting GGNRA a safer and more pleasurable experience.

The DEIS unfairly discriminates against responsible owners of well-behaved and socialized dogs by designating limitations on GGNRA use for ALL dogs based on the argument that something "might" or "could" happen.

Finally, banning off-leash (and in some cases on-leash) dogs from parts of GGNRA is an extreme step, ignoring potential incremental steps such as additional signage, warnings about habitat, natural barriers (such as vegetation near cliffs). GGNRA could, for example, require special permitting for off-leash animals on order to better track their conduct. Signs warning owners to respect specific areas during specific seasons would undoubtedly be well respected (especially given NPS' demonstrated willingness to unilaterally remove areas from access).

Corr. ID: 3595

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203694

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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 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.

· So if you have no sound scientific data to support the environmental reason to restrict areas to dogs let's 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% DID NOT INVOLVE DOGS. The problem is people, not dogs. Only 2% involve dogs. This alone should really force you to re-think the whole reason for the DEIS.

Corr. ID: 4069

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207660

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS suggests that compliance with current dog regulations is poor, but the document doesn't place the number of documented incidences of noncompliance in context with the total number of visits by dogs. On any given weekend day at Crissy Field, I would estimate around 700 dogs visit the area. The DEIS lists around 250 leash law violations over a one-year period at Crissy Field, which in the context of tens of thousands of dog visits over that same period seems extremely low. However, the DEIS uses these incomplete statistics

about noncompliance to justify the implementation of the compliance-based management strategy if compliance with new regulations falls below 75%.

Corr. ID: 4660 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209834 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The adverse impact statements claimed in the DEIS are arbitrary and subjective, even if one doesn't consider the cumulative impacts on Public Safety (e.g., dog behavior, other adjacent lands, health benefits, responsible dog guardianship, etc.) with not clear explanation for the differences (e.g., number of past incidents, number of visitors, etc.) Below is a table showing the highest level impact claimed in the DEIS in Table 5. For example, there seems no justification for listing Milagra Ridge and Pedro Point as Minor while Sweeney Ridge and Mori Point are negligible. In fact, even using the questionable numbers on page 271, no location other than Stinson Beach and Fort Funston have more than ten combined dog "bite/attacks" and hazardous condition incidents. In reality, only Fort Funston and Ocean Beach, with more than 2,000 average daily visits, had any serious incidents in 2007 or 2008 on the trails or on the beach.

Concern ID: 30175

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The DEIS did not adequately analyze that allowing dogs in smaller areas would condense/concentrate impacts compared to if impacts were spread out over an entire area (like current dog regulations) minimal effects would occur.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1510 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191434 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: You suggest that dogs damage the environment, and that can be true. However, you should consider that much of the current off-leash areas at Fort Funston and Crissy Field are paved. It really doesn't help the environment much to restrict dogs in those areas. In fact, if dogs are all concentrated into small areas the damage will be greater than if the dogs are allowed to spread out. Fort Funston and Ocean Beach are not pristine areas anyway.

Corr. ID: 1893 **Organization:** University of San Francisco

Comment ID: 200617 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Along those lines, these proposed changes may very well end up creating some of the very problems that the dog management plan is purportedly seeking to avoid. Again and again in the environmental field, we see this same story- that when spread over a large space, an impact can have very minimal effects, but when concentrated on a single area, the effects may overwhelm the local ecosystem. There are very few open spaces where dogs are allowed along the Peninsula. Sweeney Ridge is one of them. But the preferred plan concentrates dogs to a very small area of Cattle Hill. So if all of the dogs that are currently spread out over the entire area suddenly condense into a single spot, what will those impacts be?

Corr. ID: 2328 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201933 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have spent time reading the GGNRA DOG DEIS and I am concerned about the tone of the report. It's not really a process for finding a way to provide a variety of high-quality visitor uses including areas where dogs are allowed or a way to discuss how to offer national park experiences to a large urban population.

Instead, the report seems to discourage cooperation between different park users and it fails to imagine that park user groups can work together to resolve problems when they come up. Instead, it could actually increase conflict between park users as

more and more people and dogs are crammed into smaller and smaller spaces.

Corr. ID: 4091 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208403 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The other development since the CF EA, not yet analyzed in the draft Plan/DEIS, is the increased frequency and intensity of special events and some increased recreational uses. Rather than reducing off-leash recreation from approximately 70 acres to Crissy Field now to approximately 20 acres of Crissy Field under the draft Plan - effectively assuring conflicts by concentrating use and therefore setting up a complete ban - the impacts of these uses should be examined in the framework of the CF EA to formulate a fair and balanced plan.

Concern ID: 30177

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters believe the adverse impacts of on-leash and off-leash dogs is being underestimated in the DEIS or that dogs significantly affect the environment.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2284 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society and Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society

Comment ID: 201155 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In my experience, the negative impact of off-leash and even-on-leash dogs is being vastly underestimated. No matter what the leash laws are, it seems people won't obey them. So, at a minimum any off-leash areas need to be fenced, to clearly demarcate the approved off-leash areas. There must be no confusion.

Concern ID: 30178

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree with the blanket assumption that non-compliance will result in adverse impacts to the environment.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3737 **Organization:** SF Dog Owners Group

Comment ID: 204263 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Non-compliance does not equal negative impacts - The DEIS assumes that non-compliance with leash restrictions means there are negative impacts on environment by dogs. Yet there is no evidence that impacts actually happen. DEIS has to re-evaluate that assumption and must base any conclusion on actual documented impacts.

Corr. ID: 4068 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 207650 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The analysis of the "No Action" alternative assumes essentially total noncompliance with current regulations, whereas the analysis of the other four alternatives assumes the opposite—extensive compliance with the new regulations. The "No Action" alternative analysis also assumes that noncompliance with current regulations results in significant damage to the sites despite a lack of scientific documentation establishing this fact. This unequal analysis of the proposed alternatives creates a bias against the "No Action" alternative since the assumption of compliance for the other alternatives guarantees they will always have a lower impact on the area.

Concern ID: 30671

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters think that some of the environmental impacts (water quality and soil) as a result of dogs are overstated and/or they do not agree with the impacts stated in the DEIS (specifically that dogs do not create erosion problems or fecal contamination).

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 420 **Organization:** none

Comment ID: 181603 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: You talk about "fear of dog bites," yet offer no evidence that this is a problem. While you talk about environmental concerns with dog waste there again there is no evidence that dog waste is polluting the waters of the state, and in fact if DNA were done, I think you would likely find the pollution, if any, would be from people and birds.

Corr. ID: 1280 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195007 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The document does not explain why the latter substudy contradicts the former reports. The document fails to show the evidence that substudy provided and how that evidence was collected. The document fails to analyze the impact of other sources of pollution, like the sewage treatment plant at Fort Funston, garbage from people thrown on the beach, horse manure, oil spills in the bay, chemical pollution from runoffs from creeks and rivers, and the dead seals, fish, and seagulls left to rot on the beach by GGNRA. The document should analyze the effect of all this contamination on swimmers, children wading, and surfers, and explain why GGNRA has not issued warnings or restrictions against being in polluted waters, if, in fact, the waters are polluted. It seems like the GGNRA is manufacturing excuses to ban off-leash dogs from the mere 1% of the parks they now enjoy. The charge that dog feces are polluting the ocean is very disingenuous indeed, and give rise to distrust in me of GGNRA and its motives.

Corr. ID: 2201 **Organization:** Little Fluffy Clouds

Comment ID: 200704 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2. Dogs do not have a negative impact on the environment. I feel strongly that the singling out of dogs as the perpetrators of soil erosion and damage on NPS land is absurdly overstated. They no more erode the land and arguably do less damage than the daily sightings of hikers, casual walkers, horses, mountain bikers or fishermen

Corr. ID: 4064 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207629 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Another weakness of the DEIS is the failure to prove that any documented negative impacts on the area are due specifically to dogs. Because site-specific studies of GGNRA lands do not exist, there is no way to determine the extent of any negative impacts or to distinguish between impacts from dogs or humans. For instance, the DEIS refers to erosion as a major concern at Fort Funston and cites digging and climbing on cliffs by dogs as the cause. However, I have frequently seen 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 at the southern end of the Fort Funston beach and using paths other than the sand ladder to travel between the upper section of Fort Funston and the beach. This behavior must significantly contribute to erosion at the site, but no reference to human impacts on Fort Funston are mentioned in the DEIS. Also, the DEIS states that after certain areas of Fort Funston were restricted to dogs, an increase in bird presence was documented. This is cited as an example of a negative consequence of allowing dogs at Fort Funston. However, this land closure also prevented human access to these areas, which should also be considered when drawing any conclusions about impacts to wildlife.

Concern ID:

31406

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The DEIS does not adequately discuss impacts to species of special concern; by focusing only on species listed under Federal and State ESA lists, the DEIS misses impacts on non-ESA species of concern.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3149 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 203978 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Species of Concern - The DEIS does not fully describe the sensitivity of some habitat areas including Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. The plan considers species listed under the Federal and State ESA's but does not sufficiently describe non-ESA species of concern as listed by the IUCN, the American Bird Conservancy, National Audubon, and locally known species of concern. Species of local concern include:

- Allen's Hummingbird
- Black Turnstone
- Brant
- Bryant's Savannah Sparrow
- Burrowing Owl
- California Thrasher
- California Quail
- Clarks Grebe
- Elegant Tern
- Heermann's Gull
- Hermit Warbler
- Loggerhead Shrike
- Long-billed Curlew
- Long-eared Owl
- Marbled Godwit
- Northern Harrier
- Nuttall's White-crowned Sparrow
- Nuttall's Woodpecker
- Olive-sided Flycatcher
- Pelagic Cormorant
- Red Knot
- Sanderling
- San Francisco Common Yellowthroat
- Short-billed Dowitcher
- Snowy Plover
- Surfbird
- Thayer's Gull
- Tricolored Blackbird
- Varied Thrush
- Wandering Tattler
- Western Sandpiper
- Whimbrel
- Wrentit
- Yellow Warbler

Concern ID: 31409
CONCERN STATEMENT: Law Enforcement data provided does not really show the true numbers of violations, as many incidents go unreported. There should be some estimate of the number of total violations in the DEIS.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3149 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 203979 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The EIS should estimate the actual number of incidents that occur within the GGNRA. Table 6 (p. 230) indicates the recorded incidents involving dogs in 2007 and 2008. It is stated that these numbers of incidents of

visitors not complying with dog walking regulations is not equal to the number of actual violations occurring at the park. Being that many violations occur which are not observed or un-reported, some estimate of the total amount of violations should be included in the EIS such that each documented violation would be representative of a certain amount of actual violations.

Concern ID: 31415

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The importance of special status species populations in the GGNRA to the recovery of the species overall needs to be provided in the DEIS. Impacts should be based on impacts to the recovery of the species, not the localized population.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3945 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 227101 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fully disclosed the significance of the GGNRA protected species population to the recovery of the species and only reduce recreation if the recreation is proven to significantly impact the recovery of the species and other less extreme management changes are not available.

Concern ID: 31740

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Findings on dogs chasing snowy plovers \(presented in appendix G\) are often inaccurate and are actually accounts of dogs chasing other species that are not endangered.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4678 **Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog
Comment ID: 227518 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups
Representative Quote: Many of the findings in the Draft Plan/DEIS are founded on a reference included in the document as Appendix G, "Law Enforcement Data" (NPS 2008c). This reference document is critically deficient in substantiating statements made in the characterization of existing conditions and in the analysis of the environmental consequences. 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 for 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.

GA4000 - Impact Analysis: Impairment Analysis-General Methodology

There were no comments for GA4000

GC1000 - Off-leash dogs: Support

Concern ID: 29633

CONCERN STATEMENT: Off-leash dog activity results in better-behaved dogs, and provides meaningful exercise and social interaction for both dogs and their owners. Off-leash dog walking is essential to the health of many park visitors, particularly elderly and disabled visitors. Dogs that do not receive daily exercise and socialization have potential behavioral issues.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 222 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180696 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Off leash allowance encourages proper training and socialization of dogs. It affords greater physical and emotional health of dogs and their owners. And it therefore contributes to a better overall society.

Please support the happiness and health of our community by allowing dogs to be off leash.

Corr. ID: 351 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181126 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: He also needs to play with other dogs to socialize and greet other dogs naturally, which requires being off leash. It would be impractical to have him on a leash.

On another note, dog owners are motivated to exercise with their dog, which improves the health of the owner and creates a higher quality of life for the owner as well as the dog.

Corr. ID: 729 **Organization:** San Francisco Resident

Comment ID: 182728 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not move forward with the proposal to limit the off-leash accessible areas in California.

As a respectful dog owner who strives to provide a healthy, satisfying life for my animal, I urge the National Park Service not to restrict off-leash dog areas in California. In addition to the positive effects they have on the physical quality of life of the animals and their owners, the area's off-leash dog parks strengthen the community by uniting residents in a casual, social setting that encourages interaction and dialog.

Corr. ID: 1203 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194831 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Health of our Canine Friends: Dogs, especially in the City, absolutely need a place to playfully engage with each other and enhance their socialization skills. Dogs on leash are more aggressive than those off leash. On leash dogs cannot run, catch, play, scamper, visit each other in a healthy canine manner. They become frustrated; they bark; they have no way to expend the vast amount of energy that they generate. As a result of your proposed plan, dogs in the city and likely in suburban areas as well, are much more likely to be less than model citizens.

Corr. ID: 1433 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195620 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Their exercise is essential to their mental and physical health. On leash and free play in dog parks are great benefits. But off leash walking is at least as important for their development and good health.

Like their owners, dogs require daily exercise and socialization for good mental and

physical health. This cannot be achieved inside a house or apartment or, for most dogs, on a leash or in an enclosed dog pen.

Corr. ID: 1695 **Organization:** The Pooch Coach, LLC

Comment ID: 191108 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs need off-leash recreation to remain socialized + allow for proper exercise. Without this ability, the dogs will be undersocialized and under exercised, thereby possibly leading to potential issues with their behavior + health.

Corr. ID: 1730 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191186 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Some days I am in so much pain I don't think I can get out of bed but I know my dog has to run. She has kept me going for 3 years now. I know many people with walkers and canes that would be dead today if not for being able to take their dogs off leash. I see them in the rain walking with their dogs.

Corr. ID: 3580 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203635 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to you about the Dog Management Program. As a dog owner and resident in San Francisco, I am very disappointed to hear about these pending changes. I am greatly concerned that you have not consider the impact to human and dog well being. My understanding is that GGNRA has a recreation mandate. I spend much of my free time enjoying the off-leash parks with my dog Argos. Being able to bring my dog contributes greatly to my ability to enjoy the parks. Furthermore, since we live in a city, it is hard for my dog to get adequate exercise as it is. Without off leash dog parks available to us, he would not get much exercise at all. There is much research on the psychological and physical benefits to dog ownership; two articles in the New York Times recently highlighted this research. Dog owners are less likely to be overweight and have cardiovascular diseases because while walking their dogs, they get exercise themselves. More and more hospitals and senior citizens centers are utilizing dog therapy. Speaking personally, my husband adopted our dog to help me copy with a personal tragedy. I particularly enjoy taking Argos on off-leash walks where we can play fetch. The time we spend together at these parks are our happiest moments together.

Concern ID:

29634

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[Off-leash dog recreation reduces conflicts and aggression between dogs. Forcing off-leash dog recreation into smaller spaces would result in an increase in conflicts between dogs, as well as incidents between dogs and humans.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1019 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191788 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned about the upcoming vote to take place on April 14 concerning on/off leash dog areas in GGNRA. To take the off leash option away would change a lovely, unique culture that is not harming anyone. Dogs off lead are better behaved, dogs that are exercised are better behaved and dogs socialized are better behaved, and not in a closed in area, but where they can run and play without being confined.

Corr. ID: 1781 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200275 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: By preventing off-leash socialization you will be worsening the very problem you're attempting to correct, in effect hurting public safety. It is absolutely essential that dog owners are able to congregate to let their dogs exercise and play so they do not become reactive and aggressive. If we close

the national parks in the city to these activities, where will the dog owners go? There are other parks but these restrictions will increase the number of dogs at those parks and create overcrowding which will result in dogs not getting outdoors as often which means the dogs in the community will be less socialized and therefore more reactive and aggressive.

Corr. ID: 1803 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191664 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 9) Off-leash play decreases the likelihood of dog aggression in dogs. In comments to the SF Animal Control and Welfare Commission on 2/8/07, Jean Donaldson, then head of the Dog Training Program at the SPCA and a nationally recognized author on dog behavior said: "There is not only no evidence that allowing dogs off-leash for play opportunities increases the incidence of aggression, to a person, every reputable expert in the field of dog behavior in the United States is of the opinion that it is likely that off-leash access decreases the likelihood. of aggression." She also said: "Interestingly, it could very well be that the safest dogs are those that attend off-leash dog parks." And she said: "There is no research demonstrating that dog parks or off-leash play contributes to any kind of aggression, including dog-dog aggression."

10) A well-exercised dog is a well-behaved dog. Dogs that are not adequately exercised can develop behavior problems such as barking, destroying property in the home, etc. Behavior problems are one of the primary reasons that people surrender dogs at shelters. San Francisco has a "No Kill" goal that no potentially adoptable animal in a city shelter (SF Animal Care and Control, SF/SPCA, Pets Unlimited). Representatives of the SF/SPCA have said that the Preferred Alternative will make it harder for the SF/SPCA to perform their mission to reduce surrenders to city shelters and make San Francisco a truly No Kill city.

Corr. ID: 2338 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202162 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please find a way to continue off leash open space. Part of the reason it works is because the space is so large. Dogs of different temperments or sizes can find their own place to be. Most sociological studies show that crowding causes conflict in most any species. Your extreme proposal will cause crowding in the small remaining area. I am fearful that conflict will arise where nearly none existed before.

Corr. ID: 3674 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204762 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS fails to consider that the GGNRA is the front/back yard for a large metropolitan area. The fundamental purpose of creating the GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) for residents of the Bay Area. 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. I believe off-leash recreation is extremely important for dogs. Not only does it reduce problems between dogs, but it also helps foster happy, well-adjusted dogs, who don't cause problems with people. Living in an area of Oakland with very limited access to off-leash recreation, I see the difference between dogs where I live now, and dogs where i used to live in San Francisco. They aren't socialized as well. Dogs need to spend time off-leash, recreating with other dogs.

Corr. ID: 3715 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202264 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is not only no evidence that allowing dogs off-leash for play opportunities increases the incidence of aggression, to a person every

reputable expert in the field of dog behavior in the United States is of the opinion that it is likely that off-leash access decreases the likelihood of aggression. There is no research demonstrating that dog parks or off-leash play contributes to any kind of aggression, including dog-dog aggression. It was brought to my attention a couple of months ago, that claims were being made that such research existed. And so I did an exhaustive literature search as well as consulting at length numerous colleagues in dog behavior in the United States. All were amazed at the suggestion in view of no such research.

Trish King, my counterpart at the Marin Humane Society, has been publicly quoted several times as having authored research concluding off-leash play contributes to aggression. I spoke to her at length about this and we corresponded in the last couple of weeks. She has not performed or published such research. She is furthermore, and I quote, "mortified", unquote, that anyone would suggest or imply that. She believes off-leash access, if anything, prevents aggression.

Corr. ID: 4538 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209704 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I know for certain that restricting off-leash access for dogs will not only have a major impact on dog behavior it will have a major negative impact on local dog parks. I live just 1-1/2 blocks from Duboce Park and prefer not to take my dogs there because I feel now it's often overcrowded'limiting off-leash access will only make this and other neighborhood parks worse.

Concern ID:

29635

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Some commenters expressed that they would be unable to provide their dogs the necessary exercise on-leash . Dogs off-leash are able to run much more, and if they were on-leash they would be restricted to the fitness requirements of their walker. Off-leash dog walking is needed a needed practice, and should be supported.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 391 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181179 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We have a 3 year old lab who loves to run and chase a ball. We find this exercise impossible while attached to a leash. Just as humans need exercise, so do dogs. Please keep responsible dog owners within the rights to run their dogs.

Corr. ID: 629 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181319 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Almost equally important is the benefit to humans of walking their dogs outside, and allowing those dogs to get real exercise by running around off-leash. It does not provide enough exercise to most dogs to be walked on-leash all the time.

Corr. ID: 2910 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202714 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep GGNRA open to voice control dogs. Dogs need to exercise and just can not get enough exercise on a leash. I can walk or run with my dog 6-8 miles a day and it is not enough for him. When he is off the leash, he can chase a ball, run around with other dogs (good for socialization), and run circles around me. So if I walk 6-8 miles he is getting at least twice that from running around me. GGNRA voice control areas allow dogs and their owners to exercise together. I understand there are some irresponsible dog owners but please do not let that ruin it for the majority of responsible dog owners. Also, there are so few places that do allow dogs off leash, please do not reduce it more.

Corr. ID: 3179 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203754 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think that this plan to close so much of the GGNRA to off-leash dogs and their human companions is basically a huge, complicated solution to not much of (if any) a problem.

As a weekend visitor to Crissy Field and Fort Funston, I am there at peak times and I have never witnessed any sort of problem with dogs attacking or hurting people. On the contrary, the dogs I see are in heaven: getting exercise, socializing with other dogs and having a marvelous time. Also, their owners are talking with other dog owners, making pleasant conversation, relaxing and getting exercise. There is so little total acreage that is accessible to humans with their off-leash dogs in the park as it is.

Off-leash exercise is a must for many dog breeds. They simply must have off-leash exercise. My husband jogs with our Brittany regularly, but he can't possibly run fast enough or long enough to exhaust our dog. Dogs who do not get regular, quality exercise are more aggressive and just plain cranky. They also bark more --a real nuisance in crowded urban areas like the Bay Area.

I think this plan will overload the off-leash areas in San Francisco and Oakland.

I think this plan with its draconian restrictions will only serve to encourage scofflaws and add to the resentment. I think that it will result in a lot of confrontation and ill will. I would not want to be a park ranger trying to enforce this!

Corr. ID: 3183

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203757

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs need to run! There are very few places left that allow off leash exercise. For people such as myself, who are too old to run with their animals, the beach is the best environment for this activity. I am fortunate to have the ability to take my dogs to the private stretch of Stenson Beach once a week for some much appreciated ball chasing in the ocean. Most of the people I have encountered while participating in this activity genuinely enjoy watching my dogs play in the surf. I have a leash with me at all times and clean up after my dogs. The beach is actually one of the few places where people are pretty consistent about cleaning up after their dogs and keeping their dogs under control. I am personally a little tired of the attitude that all dogs must be leashed because a few may cause a problem. By all means, if someone is allowing their animal to behave inappropriately ticket them. Allow the remainder (the majority) to enjoy the beach environment with their dogs off leash. It's basically one of the last frontiers of off leash activity. What better place to enjoy that activity but in our National Park System.

Concern ID:

29636

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Off-leash areas in the GGNRA provide important space for recreation, which can be difficult to find in the Bay Area. This is especially important given the large number of dogs in San Francisco and the surrounding areas that require off-leash exercise.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 195

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182307

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep the parks open and accessible to dogs and people who and care for them. So little of the city has space for dogs as it is, to further limit the spaces available for dogs to run and play would be a tragic loss of my rights as a dog owner and citizen of the county and state.

Corr. ID: 1757 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191491 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While I appreciate the reasoning behind some of the proposed changes, I believe that we still need to keep a balance of leisure activities with our pets. There are limited areas in the San Francisco area where we can take our pets and enjoy some off-leash play with them and I'm concerned about further removing access to these areas. There are better ways to mitigating some of the concerns for which the plan was created: fines for not picking up dog waste, clearly delineated on-leash and off-leash areas where park visitors can choose their setting, more fenced-in dog play areas to protect wild life, etc.

Corr. ID: 1971 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200343 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel strongly that the GGNRA lands that currently allow dogs should not be further restricted. San Francisco community has been a leader in advocating animal welfare and the human-animal bond, and taking away access to these areas would certainly have a negative impact. Because this is an urban area, there are very limited recreational areas where we can actively enjoy the outdoors and get the physical exercise we need. There are too few parks in the city and local Bay Area and the dog accessible and off-leash open areas are even more restricted.

Corr. ID: 3225 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202624 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We need somewhere to go off leash. There is a way to make this work without entirely closing these areas off to the dogs off leash. There are so many dogs and so many dog owners in this City, that if you eliminate off leash areas, you are not servicing a critical need and significant population of the City/State/US residents of San Francisco, Marin County, San Mateo County and EastBay visitors (who come into the City to walk their dogs off-leash in these beautiful areas of the City).

Corr. ID: 3712 **Organization:** Private citizen

Comment ID: 202253 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As an owner of multiple dogs, the ability to take my dogs to hiking trails and beaches legally is something that has become an intrinsic part of our lives. It is something that we do on a weekly basis, as long as weather permits. These outings are so much a part of what makes the bay area a such a special and wonderful place to live for both people and their dogs. Both dogs and their companions hike, and relax. This fosters easy-going, happy and relaxed states of mind that in turn is also passed along to the community in the form of our interactions with each other. We are responsible dog owners who make sure that our dogs are well-behaved, free of disease and we always have poop bags on hand. There are already so many parts of the GGNRA where dogs are prohibited. I feel that this new dog plan is another way to slowly eliminate dogs from the GGNRA altogether. That will force dog owners to either use the parks and trails illegally or have to stay on city streets which are already congested and not a place for recreation.

A study by National Geographic showed that there are more dogs in San Francisco than children under 18 years of age. All of these people and families need places to go and hike and run.

Please don't take away the few places left that responsible dog owners can take their dogs off-leash

Concern ID:
CONCERN

29637

[Regardless of whether you own a dog or not, it is pleasurable to watch dogs](#)

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): running free. Many people cited this as a source of joy within their experience in the GGNRA. Dogs, particularly off-leash dogs, are part of the identity of the city.

Corr. ID: 301 **Organization:** None

Comment ID: 181039 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm not a dog owner, nor lover, but I LIKE the dogs running around Crissy Field and the East Beach, Presidio, SF. The owner's are responsible, clean up is diligent. I'm a native. My wife and I walk to the bridge every weekend we're in town and have at least a decade before the Haas built the promenade. It's a beautiful, wonderful area. Let the dogs alone.

Corr. ID: 898 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191248 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been in these areas many, many times, and found immense joy in the dogs on the beach. I have seen responsible pet owners pick up after their pets, and show people how to interact with them. I have never ever seen any bad behavior that was not swiftly taken care of, and I have rarely even seen any bad behavior. this area needs to remain off leash as one of the few areas like this for dogs to have this sort of recreation.

Corr. ID: 1184 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193562 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am an amateur bird watcher. I do not have a dog. And I support allowing dogs to have off-leash areas. I believe that if you post signs saying "Caution: Dogs Cannot Chase Wildlife or the Off Leash Status Will Be Revoked". Peer pressure will be far more effective than issuing tickets to stop errant behavior.

Having numerous off-leash areas for dog recreation is important for both humans and dogs. Both get to socialize and exercise in a healthy manner. At off-leash areas it is remarkable on how fit both the dogs and the owners are at all ages. Please do not let a few sour grapes ruin the passion of so many.

Currently, I get to visit the dogs off-leash which has brought me great joy as I bird watch. There is plenty of room for birds and well behaved dogs.

Corr. ID: 3230 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202677 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Although I agree that wildlife needs to be protected there is no evidence that dogs are harmful or endanger these bird. I would say that most dog lovers are also lovers of all animals both domestic and wild and would not like to see any harmed. For years there has been an are curtained off for the Snowy Plovers and I know that while most dogs are of leash the owners make sure they do not go onto the protected area.

Protecting wildlife and allowing dogs off leash is not mutually exclusive, both can occur. Allowing off leash dog areas is beneficial to humans, it provides great joy to see your dog run after a ball, it is motivation for me to walk with my dog. Walking on leash is no where near as enjoyable. As city dwellers it is crucial for our human well being to have off leash dog areas particualry near and on the beaches.

Corr. ID: 3557 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203475 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Here in San Francisco, the dogs are very much part of, and an indentifying characteristic of the community we live in. The City is an incredibly dog friendly city, which in turn, makes it just a friendly city. Our dog doesn't run off leash as he has never really mastered the coming back part and has one too many times swum out farther than his ability-but that doesn't stop us from enjoying the area or relishing in the pure joy you see on the faces of these dogs

running free-in an urban oasis-and their people taking in the scene, talking to friends and making new friends. I have a two year old daughter-and I can't even begin to describe the joy she takes in watching the dogs play, swim, run and "dance."

This is about the dogs, yes, but it's also about the people. I don't want to live somewhere where joy is kept on a leash. It will permeate all aspects of our community.

San Francisco is the last place in the country where I expected joy to be kept on a leash. Life is hard enough-why would we take such action to take something away as vital to our community?

Corr. ID: 4072

Organization: Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP

Comment ID: 207760

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In areas where dogs are permitted off leash, both the dog owners and the non-dog owners among us value the ability of dogs to run leash-free. Dogs are an essential part of the landscape at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Muir Beach, and other areas, and the draw of these places lies largely in the opportunity to interact with and watch dogs enjoying the open space. I know from personal experience with my golden retriever at Crissy Field and Fort Funston that many people enjoy and appreciate the joy of a dog splashing through the ocean in pursuit of a ball or stick.

Concern ID:

29638

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Off-leash dog walking does not have a detrimental impact on natural resources, especially wildlife. Many justifications for removing areas with off-leash dog walking are not validated, and a balance between resources and off-leash dogs can be reached.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 334

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181101

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very aware of the need to preserve nesting space for the Snowy Plover. I am a conservationist and work at The California Academy of Science. My dog and I have respected the nesting area near the pier and never go there off leash.

Dogs and their owners need space to run and enjoy the coastline. Many of the reasons given for imposing leash laws, such as dog attacks to beachgoers and dog walkers not being responsible for picking up, are not realistic and do not reflect the what goes on at Chrissy Field each day.

San Francisco is known as a city that welcomes 'Life' in many ways and having the space to let a dog run free should not be something one needs to forfeit when living here.

Corr. ID: 387

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181175

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA should allow dogs off leash on its lands. As long as the owners/walkers are responsible and voice control the dogs, the impact on wildlife and other recreational users can be minimized.

Corr. ID: 1032

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191819

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am also a conservationist and have managed nature centers in the bay area and run watershed awareness programs for Alameda County. If I thought dogs were seriously endangering wildlife, I wouldn't advocate for their off-leash privileges.

Corr. ID: 1518

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190677

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: But I must say that it is over blown and to restrictive to peoplpe who have lived - a life time in this area. I am a native and have enjoyed this area since childhood. The native species have not been affected since that time. The only adverse affect has been our failure to stop the onslaut of humans coming in. I have exercised my dogs off leach in all these areas, and will continue.

I love Sharp Park Gold Course and have let my dog swim in the lagune for many years and have not seen any reduction in the number of frogs or snakes.

Corr. ID: 1606 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190844 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a San Francisco dog owner and dog supporter, I cannot agree w/ your proposed plan. Off-leash dog parks/areas are already difficult to come by and there is NO reason to restrict them even further. Dogs for the most part (grand majority) pose no threat to the habitat and outside visitors. It is extremely rare to see an aggressive or un-controlled dog running off leash or even being walked among other dogs on-leash.

Concern ID:

29639

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The parks should remain open to off-leash dog walking. This is important to those visitors who enjoy utilizing the park with their dogs. There are plenty of areas for those who do not enjoy dogs within the GGNRA and at other local parks. Off-leash walking brings people in contact with nature, allowing them to learn about it want to protect it.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 507 **Organization:** Soceity Dogs

Comment ID: 181901 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep these areas so dogs can run around off leach. A healthy dog needs to get its energy out and play just like kids and there are very few safe places that you can take your dog to enjoy the outdoors and run as it is.

Corr. ID: 804 **Organization:** Sierra club

Comment ID: 186045 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One of the great pleasures of the GGNRA is the near complete absence of regulation. It is a place where people are free to enjoy on of the most beautiful places in the world with very little restriction.Keep the dogs free; they are a pleasant addition to this beautiful park.

Corr. ID: 1032 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191821 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Bay Area is unique in the great gift we have in the Regional Parks and National Recreation Areas. Part of this great gift is the immense pleasure of being able to hike with one's dog in the off-leash areas of these parks. If you reduce the off-leash access in these parks, you will be greatly reducing the gift that the bay area gives her residents.

Corr. ID: 1099 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192280 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am one of the thousands of people who enjoy the off leash areas in the Bay Area. I am there with my dog every possible opportunity I get. To deprive us of this benefit to enjoy these open spaces would be an absolute travesty. Please do not remove the opportunity for us to enjoy nature with our best friends.

Corr. ID: 1296 **Organization:** representing herself

Comment ID: 195030 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a resident of the Bay Area for 27 years, I ask for continue flexibility and inclusion in the regulations of the park - a hallmark of our

local culture.

Please do not restrict the use of the Park by private citizens and their dogs.

I oppose the decrease in off-leash areas in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 1966 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200502 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please think long and hard about taking away off leash dog use of national park land. The off leash dog parks in San Francisco are crowded already, and if you take away use of these lands they will be much harder and more expensive for city parks to maintain. Also the parks in the city are mostly unfenced and are in high traffic areas, potentially hazardous for the dogs and automobile traffic.

Corr. ID: 2050 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193304 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Visitors already have plenty of places to visit where dogs aren't allowed. Can you just leave the dogs the little off-leash areas that they have left?

Corr. ID: 2820 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 201128 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is part of responsible dog ownership to give one's dog adequate exercise every day. For dogs any bigger than pint size, this means they must be allowed to run off leash for part of that time. This is a simple need of the animals. Anything short of this is not humane. It must be our job to assure that there are places convenient to where people live where dogs can be exercised off leash. Dog parks are not the answer.

Just as parks and recreation authorities need to be sensitive to the needs of the dogs, so owners need to take responsibility for their dog's behavior. They must watch that their dog doesn't get into an altercation with another dog, clean up after it, leash it when near wildlife, and otherwise keep it on voice command when it is not on the leash.

All of this is common sense and should not require expensive studies.

Corr. ID: 2990 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203738 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: San Francisco is a unique place and the beautiful areas with off leash dogs are a wonderful thing. I am currently NOT a dog owner, but I have found that the majority of the time the dog owners in the off leash areas are very responsible for their dogs.

There are a lot of dogs in the city that need a place to run. There are absolutely not enough viable places to do this if the new restrictions take place.

There are plenty of places where there are already leash laws in place... Please allow dog owners and dog lovers to have the opportunity to continue to enjoy our part of the park, the way we have been able to in the past.

Corr. ID: 3494 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203372 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Third, by restricting more GGNRA land to dogs and pet owners you will place an incredible burden on existing San Francisco off-leash dog areas, and give those of us living in San Mateo County fewer and fewer options for taking care of our animals properly. Around one third of Bay Area residents own dogs, and many of these dogs need daily off-leash exercise to avoid canine

behavioral problems. The more you make it difficult for busy people to exercise their dogs, the more likely it is that these dogs will have behavioral problems and end up in shelters. The alternative is to restrict dog ownership, especially ownership of medium and large dogs, to wealthy people who can afford to own private land. To provide sizable off leash access at places like Ft Funston is part of the mission of GGNRA to provide for the needs of all Bay Area and San Mateo County residents regardless of income and living situation. There are dozens and dozens of parks and wildlife areas in the Bay Area and northern California that do not allow dogs. We need the GGNRA to expand tiny percentage of dog-friendly parks and trails, not restrict them further.

Corr. ID: 3786 **Organization:** Cayuga Improvement Association

Comment ID: 205540 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I really do think there is a way for people to enjoy the GGNRA and to protect nature and to allow dogs off leash. I actually see allowing dogs off leash is a way for people who would have resigned themselves to walking their dogs on city streets or just going to a dog park to get out and see nature and want to protect it. The more areas we open up to more people the more people will see that open space and wildlife should be protected.

Corr. ID: 4453 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208498 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep the GGNRA open and available for off-leash dog play so City dwellers can develop the love of nature required to support environmental protection nationwide.

Concern ID: 29641

CONCERN STATEMENT: [There should be some areas open to off-leash dog walking. Removing these areas will impact city parks and streets, and may result in increased noncompliance with the regulations.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 819 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186082 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would be so upset if dogs were prohibited from being off-leash in the GGNRA. Please do not close off these beautiful areas to our dogs and create an unnecessary leash law.

Corr. ID: 1120 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192376 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am not a dog owner but I do not agree with this dog management plan. I honestly don't see many dogs on city streets off leash currently and if this plan goes through, I feel all that will change. I enjoy not having dogs running free on city streets. And this is probably because most dogs in the city go to the off leash dog areas like Funston and Chrissy Fields so dogs can run free and safely away from traffic. I think if the off leash areas are limited and/or taken away, there WILL be more dogs on and off leash walking on city streets.

Corr. ID: 1673 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191071 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not adopt a policy that prevents people & their dogs from the freedom of walking without a leash. It is very important to consider that not only are dogs benefiting from the freedom but people too.

Corr. ID: 1766 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191518 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned about the upcoming vote to take place on April 14 concerning on/off leash dog areas in GGNRA. I am an avid walker and take my dog to many of the areas that are under consideration. I love living in. SF

partly because of how friendly and open the spaces are. I watch regularly how dog owners pick up litter as well as their dogs feces. We have happy dogs and people living here and I think that is really special. To take the off leash option away would change a lovely, unique culture that is not harming anyone.

Corr. ID: 1822 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191929 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We strongly disagree with GGNRA's potential banning of off-leash dogs from the areas they are currently allowed. These places are the few left in San Francisco and Marin where we can run our dogs to properly exercise them. Well-exercised dogs are good citizens and good family members.

Corr. ID: 2253 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201010 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We need more off leash territories in the city of San Francisco. Eliminating natural space for dogs to run around grass and sand, beach and trees will only lead to more dogs being off-leash in areas that concerned parties feel are safe as they are legally only on-leash. It is unreasonable to assume owners will drive 30-40 minutes to areas outside the city for dogs to roam daily, and it is also inhumane to expect dogs to be onleash at all times outside the home, excepting within muddy, sandy small dogpark enclosures

Corr. ID: 3564 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203544 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been taking my canine companion, Ringo, to Fort Funston for over four years. I and all my friends have been most respectful of this area. And having dogs there makes it so much more of an interesting experience than it would be otherwise. The area is beautiful and remains that way with humans and dogs frequenting the area. It would be a great loss to SF should such areas be inaccessible to off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 3610 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203996 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not take the Draconian move of banning dogs from our public spaces. Dogs bring so much joy to lives - study after study shows that people who own pets are happier and better adjusted. People who are out walking their dogs are some of our most responsible, involved citizens: people who love our beautiful Bay Area, care about wellness and health. The vast majority of dog walkers are conscientious - don't punish everyone for the few that aren't. Educate dog owners, enforce fines for the ones who misbehave, but don't just ban everyone. I've lived here my whole life (half a century) and dog owners are far more responsible and engaged than they were in the past. People's lives are tough right now: don't take away a source of joy and happiness.

Concern ID: 29642

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters supported off-leash dog walking, but believe it should be restricted in certain areas for the protection of natural resources, particularly wildlife and endangered species.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2394 **Organization:** Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Comment ID: 202360 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am both a strong supporter of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy and a dog owner who enjoys some of the designated off-leash areas of the GGNRA with my dogs. While I do not believe that we should put endangered species at risk, I do believe that there is a way to regulate recreational use that would provide designated off-leash areas that do not threaten wildlife

habitat and that a flat ban is an overreaction to the issue.

Corr. ID: 2505 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200723 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: WHILE I ENJOY ALLOWING MY DOGS TO GO OFF LEASH, I DON'T BELIEVE THAT ALL AREAS ARE APPROPRIATE FOR THAT ACTIVITY. IF WILDLIFE IS AT RISK THEN DOGS AND PEOPLE MUST FIND OTHER AREAS TO ROAM FREELY

Corr. ID: 2538 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200777 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am speaking as a person who loves dogs and understands that they need areas in which to run off-leash, but who also believes that such areas must be created far away from wildlife, especially endangered species. Allowing dogs to disturb wildlife and harm or destroy such wildlife's natural habitat is unacceptable. I support banning off-leash dogs, and even on-leash dogs, in habitats where their presence is a danger to native and/or endangered animals and plant life.

Corr. ID: 3322 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202927 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I understand the value of off-leash recreation areas for dogs. I only ask that such areas be enclosed and located where is will not adversely impact the habitat of endangered, threatened or candidate species. This allows dogs to have an outlet for the exercise and socialization they need, and allows those species (and other park users) to enjoy the park in their own ways that are equally deserving of protection.

Corr. ID: 3382 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203126 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to share my comments on the off-leash policy. I am a dog owner and love to let my dogs run when I can, but only in responsible areas. Dogs should not be allowed access to harass wild life. This is the policy at Pt. Reyes National park for example and it is a great rule. The park is calm, beautiful and clean from pet messes. Pets are allowed in designated areas only. Dogs should have restricted off-leash areas or a dog park that protect them from wild life and more importantly the wild life from them. In addition, pet owners often ignore their pet's behavior and messes in public areas. I speak from experience here. Wild life and dogs don't mix. The primary goal should be to protect wildlife and this can be accomplished very simply with a dog park area.

Corr. ID: 3921 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205723 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree we need some sort of reform. Seeing the animosity arise in the city over this issue made me realize that its not working as well as it could be.

I still strongly believe we need to maintain off leash dog walking areas for dogs under voice control

Corr. ID: 4345 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209488 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While I do indeed support wildlife and habitat conservation, there also absolutely must be conservation of sufficient habitat for dogs and their people to play off-leash. Multi-use open space that includes off-leash dog walking is compatible and sustainable with all other recreational uses and with the preservation of habitat and wildlife within the GGNRA. The EIR "preferred plan" simply fails to conserve sufficient habitat for the dogs to play off-leash, the additional restrictions proposed lack common sense or factual support,

and ignore the GGNRA mandate to truly serve the wide-ranging Bay Area community.

GC2000 - Off-leash dogs: Oppose

Concern ID: 29750

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Off-leash dogs have a negative impact on wildlife, particularly threatened and endangered species, as well as on other natural and cultural resources. Many dog owners allow their off-leash dogs to chase shorebirds, enter sensitive habitats, trample plants, and dig.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 299

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181037

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to express my support for the proposed new restrictions on off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. As a Sunset district San Francisco resident, I see first hand the frequent abuse of the park by dog owners. Too many owners allow their dogs to roam freely (when supposedly under voice control or on leash), chasing shorebirds and defecating freely.

Corr. ID: 953

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191563

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Further, the current off-leash areas are getting totally destroyed with dogs running off-trail and digging up plants. Dog owners think it's cute and not destructive. I have pointed it out to dog owners who do not respond politely and do not stop their dog from destroying the park. Other dog owners even come to the defence of the owner. And the few owners that do say they are sorry and know that they are breaking the rules, will call their dogs and the dogs don't respond. Then the person has to go off-trail and chase after the unleashed dog. There really should be no off-leash areas for these reasons. So if you must appease his unruly group, please have off-leash areas completely fenced off.

Corr. ID: 1086

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192221

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Too often, dogs on-leash end up off-leash, with bad consequences for native wildlife which have already lost much of their habitat.

Considering how humans have ruined so much habitat for wildlife, some sacrifices are in order to keep natural areas natural. It's selfish for people to disregard the needs of nature.

These are not city parks, but natural lands.

I used to run my dog on the beach when I was young and didn't know any better. My dog and I had fun but she did chase birds. I wouldn't do that again.

There are some beaches where people can run their dogs off-leash. It's only right that birds have a bit of safe beach where they can feed, rest and raise their chicks.

Corr. ID: 2660

Organization: NPCA

Comment ID: 195437

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is wholly unreasonable for the park to continue to permit unregulated activities that disturb wildlife like western snowy plovers and marine mammals. Wildlife take refuge on Golden Gate's beaches to rest, breed, and rebuild energy for survival; yet unregulated off-leash dog recreation in these areas has resulted in habitat encroachment and wildlife harassment by dogs. As a telling

example, the park has reported that unleashed dogs represent the most significant recreational threat to wintering western snowy plovers.

Corr. ID: 3271 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202803 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge you to protect the wildlife in and around the park, and to ensure that offleash dogs do not continue to be the greatest peril to the survival of park wildlife. I am a dog lover and "owner" of several companion animals, but I would not think of allowing my dogs free reign in an area that is fragile to begin with. I realize the protection and oversight of these areas may not be a priority in light of current economic realities for the city, but it's imperative, nonetheless. Once gone, these species will not be replaced.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

And I applaud you for limiting off-road access to these areas as well.

Concern ID:

29751

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters felt that their health and safety had been threatened by off-leash dogs, even if they liked dogs, as well as their experience at the park. They noted that there was little response by dog owners to their concerns when threatened. Off-leash dogs also result in more feces that are not seen by their owners, which can have health and visitor experience impacts.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 306 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181049 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The sight of a large off-leash dog bounding toward me is truly scary. I like dogs and I have owned dogs, but with a strange dog I do not know what to expect and fear being knocked down or worse. Also, as a nature lover, I deeply resent the damage that dogs do to bird and plant habitats. I can see dogs on my city street any day; I go to GGNRA to see species that I cannot see at home. These species have as much right to survive as do domestic pets. I am deeply opposed to off-leash dogs in GGNRA and other public parks.

Corr. ID: 1049 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192130 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not understand the oft militant stance of many dog owners-that their dogs must run free to properly exercise, and that they are not prepared to compromise at a park that is visited by numerous tourists and walkers/joggers like me, who have no dog, and want to just enjoy the beauty and serenity of the park.

Corr. ID: 1305 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195042 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As an owner of an unruly, aggressive dog, I would LOVE to see leash laws enacted and enforced. Too often we have bad encounters because people have their dogs off leash. Enacting and enforcing a leash law will keep everybody safe.

Also, off-leash dogs tend to run everywhere, thus disturbing wildlife and ruining the plant life. We stay on trails to protect nature, so it stands to reason that our dogs should too.

Corr. ID: 1964 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200493 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I wanted to send a letter of support for your decision to ban dogs off leash in GGNRA. I support this because it will allow me to once again enjoy the park without the harassment of dog mobs and dog owners. I have been provoked twice by dog walkers with dog packs who treated me as if they owned the

park. Both times I simply made comments about keeping the dogs away from me (I have been bitten once by a unleashed dog and am not comfortable around them...not in SF). I do not need to or want to be intimidated by roaming dogs and dog owners which seems to be the case, esp. at Ft Funston.

Corr. ID: 2691 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195512 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the leash requirement for nearly all locations since off-leash dogs that owners "claim" to be voice-controlled can overcome this control and easily get away or be out of hearing distance. Also, the use of long, extendable leashes often results in uncontrolled dog behavior or they wrap around their owner (one recently died as a consequence of this) or other walkers and other dogs. I should not have to feel as if every time I walk that I have to plan for self-defense from the dogs, their long leashes if they have one, and in a number of cases, self-righteous dog-owners who view their "babies" as having more rights than any human, both adults and children.

In some areas of the GGNRA such as Fort Funston, it is now dangerous to bring young children given the large number of large dogs that are not sufficiently controlled. There are too many recent news items of unleashed dogs attacking adults, children and other dogs - with tragic consequences.

Corr. ID: 2939 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202402 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A few years ago, I took my family out to the beach at Chrissy Field for a picnic. We sat on the Beach sand to be near the soothing sounds of the water. After spreading out a nice repast on the picnic cloth, along come two huge dogs running right across the middle of our food, completely startling my parents and us and ruining our food. I said to the owner "call you dogs", she snapped at me, that this was a dog area and she could do what she wanted. She was very nasty, completely ruining our day. She acted as if she owned the beach and we did not belong there!!

Corr. ID: 4210 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208860 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Most dogs are being run off-leash in all areas. The so-called guardians seem amused when their dogs chase animals, dig, run up to other people. The so-called "voice control"? Please! This is the favorite farce of the people running dogs. Some of the time, they cannot even see their dogs. I recently witnessed an incident on the Presidio at Crissy Field in which an unleashed (pretty much unaccompanied) dog chased a gull and in so doing galluped by a man in a wheelchair who was attempting to wheel down a slight slope. As the dog ran by, it bumped against the man's feet in the wheelchair, greatly startling him. No one was hurt, but we wondered if anyone was with the dog. After about 45 seconds, a man did appear who seemed, maybe, to be the dog's guardian. We could not tell as the only behavior indicating any relationship came from the dog, not the man who did absolutely nothing but ride by on his bicycle. By all means, yes, please, please control this out-of-control homo sapien behavior.

Concern ID: 29752

CONCERN STATEMENT: [GGNRA should be in accordance with other NPS sites in prohibiting off-leash dogs. It would be easier to enforce rules if all dogs were on-leash, as they are at other parks.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2155 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200523 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I like dogs, but do not want them roaming free in the National Parks. All dogs should be on a leash at all times while in the park! I've been approached by off-leash dogs numerous times in the park and have been growled at and barked at. It's not fair that I should be afraid of someone's pet while I'm enjoying a National Park. There are plenty of Dog Parks here in San Francisco - let's not turn our National Parks into National Dog Parks.

Corr. ID: 2511 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200749 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I don't believe that dogs should be allowed off leash in a national recreation area. I do believe that preservation of wildlife should be a priority.

Corr. ID: 2531 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200766 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In every other National Park I've ever visited (and that is quite a few of them), dogs are never allowed off of a leash. I was quite surprised to discover that they are allowed off of a leash in the GGNRA.

The point of course, is to protect the natural environment, wildlife, visitors, and the dogs themselves. So I don't understand why unleashed dogs are permitted in this particular park.

I don't want it to sound as if I don't like dogs. On the contrary... we are a dog owning family. And we take good care of our dog, and always work to keep her safe.

I would urge the NPS to keep the rules consistent across all parks, and require dogs to be leashed at all times. It's the safest thing for all involved.

Corr. ID: 4470 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208702 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As you know, the GGNRA has many threatened and endangered species including the SF garter snake and red-legged frog. Please protect all the wildlife in the Park, the way National Parks are supposed to, by not allowing dogs to run loose. Dogs have other places to run; the wildlife does not.

Concern ID:

29753

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters feel that there are too many dogs in the GGNRA to allow them to be off-leash. Many owners do not use effective voice control, and are not in command of their dogs. Additionally, commenters feel that it was unlikely that dog owners would comply with regulations regarding off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 897 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191242 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The idea of "voice control" in lieu of a leash is ludicrous. I have yet to observe a dog that is 100% responsive to voice commands. On a number of occasions I have encountered groups of dogs on single track trails running ahead of their "master" some 200 feet, and out of sight of said master. Where is "voice control" or any control for that matter in these situations?

Corr. ID: 1068 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192191 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The so called voice control areas are a complete joke. I have seen dozens of dogs running wild, jumping on people and barking in a threatening fashion. The owners call the dogs but the dogs pay absolutely no attention. The dogs of Marin county are spoiled and untrained.

Corr. ID: 1496 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191339 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 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.

Corr. ID: 1648 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191033 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dogwalkers have become a major problem in the GGNRA because existing leash laws are generally ignored. There are simply too many dogs in the GGNRA to allow for offleash (unless there is a fenced-in dog-run).

Concern ID:
CONCERN
STATEMENT:

29755
Although off-leash dog walking has historically been allowed in many parts of the GGNRA, this does not mean that it should be automatically allowed in the future. The impacts on resources need to be evaluated. Although dog walkers may feel entitled to off-leash dog walking in all areas, this does not automatically make it the best solution.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2314 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195288 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 5. The fact that off-leash dogs have "traditionally" occupied many areas of GGNRA (Ocean Beach, Chrissy Field) does not imply that this tradition must continue. Such customs have to be constantly reevaluated in the light of new information about dog impacts on people and wildlife. The increasing numbers of dogs using these areas, for example, is in itself enough reason to reevaluate such practices.

Corr. ID: 2806 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 201102 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dog owners keep on citing the pet policy of 1979, a time when there were less people, less dogs and thus less conflicts. Times have changed and so must policies. It does not work to have off leash dogs in a dense urban setting and I feel that off leash recreation should be limited to private property. Meaning that the GGNRA should not allow any off leash dog areas. Many people including myself avoid areas with dogs but would enjoy them if there were no dogs.

Corr. ID: 3909 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 205569 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am a dog owner and I take my dog to designated off-leash dog parks throughout San Francisco and Marin(where there are many already!). There is no need to have our nation's National Parks also serve as a defacto dog park for a few local residents and commercial dog walkers. It is very difficult to walk your dog on-leash when everyone else's dog runs up and jumps on me and often threatens my on-leash dog.

Corr. ID: 4159 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208719 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With so many pets in our area, this growing attitude that "my dog" is entitled to "run free" is just irresponsible, harmful, and, frankly, selfish and rude. Sadly the number of such owners is growing.

Owners of pets have the responsibility to provide space at home for the pet to exercise or the owners need to be willing to travel to a dog park or other designated dog area, or walk the dog with a leash. I have many friends who do this and their dogs are happy and healthy. The national parks belong to people.

GC3000 - General Comment: Support current management

Concern ID: 30536

***CONCERN
STATEMENT:***

Current laws are adequate to protect park resources, and new laws do not need to be enforced. No further restrictions are necessary, as the current rules are working. This area is an urban park, and recreational rights must be maintained, as was agreed upon during the formation of the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 289

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181016

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These restrictions are unnecessary and unwarranted. The existing rules have worked for a long time...but the Park Service continues to show its determination to have its way including the manner in which the public hearing process is being managed without an open microphone for speakers at the various locations.

Corr. ID: 1489

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191292

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These areas are located in the middle of a big city. It is unreasonable to apply rules created for areas such as Yosemite and the Grand Canyon to a "national park" in a densely populated city. Bay Area residents have been coming to these areas with their dogs for as long as people have been using them.

There have been no significant problems associated with off-leash dogs. I've been going to these areas for the last 18 years with my dogs and my son from the time he was an infant. Why should this change?

Corr. ID: 1797

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200296

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: May I ask that you keep all areas of the GGNRA which are currently open to off-leash dog walking, open to that usage.

These areas were given to the GGNRA with the understanding that traditional usages would be preserved. Those usages are of course different than those at say, Yellowstone. Attempting to recreate a dogless environment in an area in which dogs have run for years would be a violation of that agreement.

Corr. ID: 1834

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191973

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Our preference is that the Park Service adopt Alternate "A" leaving the 1979 Pet Policy in place without changes; it's the old saying, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it". It is a policy that has served us well until the Park Service assumed responsibility, and initiated its aggressive and inappropriate management of these areas. We also support opening ROLA's in the San Mateo GGNRA Lands.

Corr. ID: 2869

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202797

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In brief, it is my opinion that the 1979 Pet Policy is good legislation and if it is not broke we don't need to fix it. In 1978, the GGNRA took the position that "the ordinary guidelines outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations do not really apply in an urban area," and that "people and their animals have been visiting the park for too long to apply an all-inclusive arbitrary policy." Based on that position, the GGNRA, with a great deal of public input, drafted what is now known as the 1979 Pet Policy; and it is working just fine.

Corr. ID: 3092 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201436 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support staying with the "Alternative A: No Action, continuation of existing management" proposal.

Living in a city means density. People don't have yards for their dogs to run free. And dogs need exercise. Our parks are our back yards and the designated areas where dogs can run free are precious and few. My husband and I often go to Crissy Field and walk on the beach and by the field, just to see and pet the happy dogs we find there.

NPS regulations might be appropriate in rural destinations, but in an urban park, they need the flexibility to alter the rules.

Corr. ID: 3761 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204658 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my opposition to dog management rules proposed by the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas.

The current restrictions are more than adequate to protect wildlife, the land, to encourage the urban parks' use, and to accommodate park users who do not like dogs.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

30537

Current off-leash dog walking should be kept open. Dogs and dog walkers need to have an opportunity for extended off-leash dog walking, which can be hard to find in the area. So little of GGNRA land is already allowed for off-leash walking, it should not be restricted.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 276 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180896 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep these spaces open (off-leash) to dogs. There are really no other options in the City where you can have an extended off-leash experience. It is important to the health of dogs and the health of the community to preserve access to those spaces

Corr. ID: 1545 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190733 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I don't believe there needs to be any action at this. Off leash areas in San Mateo are already scarce.

GGNRA concerns are premature.

Current environmental concerns do not warrant changes to off leash areas

Corr. ID: 1756 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191489 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We urge you to implement the 1979 Pet Policy as a Special Regulation for the GGNRA. The 1979 Pet Policy was the product of extensive negotiation, and has served us well. It comprises less than 1% of the entire GGNRA acreage, and is the controlling legal authority of the GGNRA at this

time.

Corr. ID: 1839

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192000

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I hope you will consider retaining off-leash access for dogs in GGNRA. I feel very strongly about this, not just for the health, safety, and well-being of our dogs, but also of our families.

Dogs provide tremendous service to many people and families, and to relegate them to on-leash walks at human place, with little opportunity for native interaction with nature and themselves is not adequate and not fair.

Corr. ID: 2945

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203416

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a dog owner and walker in San Francisco, I do not want to see more restrictions on off-leash areas in GGNRA. Already 1% of the recreation area is off limits to dogs. To restrict it further would be unfair to dogs AND their owners (tax payers that help fund the GGNRA). Dogs naturally need areas to roam free and run - this promotes a healthy mental state within the animal. By reducing this freedom, canines will be insufficiently exercised and will pose more of a threat to the local community as their stress levels increase.

By restricting more off-leash areas within GGNRA, thousands of dogs and their owners will move to the city parks, which will effectively become destroyed. Everyone has to make compromises in life, so why can't the GGNRA make one to allow dogs in the areas it always has?

It is unethical to place this potential burden on the city parks, which hundreds of thousands in San Francisco enjoy.

Please don't restrict off-leash areas in the GGNRA!

Corr. ID: 3781

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205165

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is important to keep the GGNRA open to people with their dogs and continue to allow off-leash dog walking in areas already open to people with dogs and off-leash walking as allowed in the 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy. I propose that you maintain current usage, your Alternative A.

Corr. ID: 4145

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208635

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Since a new plan is not currently in place, Alternative A is the best plan. There are a huge number of dog owners in the Bay Area who depend on the GGNRA for off-leash dog recreation, and the number is only growing. Limiting their access to less than 1% not only makes the GGNRA a less desirable place to go, it diminishes the Bay Area as a whole as a desirable place to live. Dog owners would have one less reason to put up with the high cost of living if their wonderful places to recreate are taken away. Returning to the 1979 Pet Policy, which had been working so well for so many years, appears to be the best solution for our active outdoor community.

Concern ID:

30538

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Choosing alternative A, or the current management, would allow for continued dog recreation, which is important to the health, happiness, and quality of life of residents and dogs in the area. This is the most balanced option for the community.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 395

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181187

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please don't implement laws that would reduce our quality of life in this beautiful area. It seems to me things are fine the way they are.

Corr. ID: 645

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181436

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: However, the restrictiveness of your ANPR for PET MANAGEMENT IN GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA is not balanced and does not reflect the values of the community in which GGNRA is located. In my considered judgment, the current rules which allow dog and non-dog areas, leash and non-leash areas, are much more balanced and more closely reflect the values of the community in which GGNRA is located. I urge you to eliminate or amend your proposed rules.

Corr. ID: 1348

Organization: Save Off Leash.com

Comment ID: 195188

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to plead with the GGNRA to PLEASE keep the parks open to dogs and off-leash walking throughout the parks. This extreme proposal will completely change the way we experience the wonderful parks and beaches that have been such an asset to the people and dogs of San Francisco.

Corr. ID: 4060

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207605

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support maintaining the current, traditional off leash dog regions on GGNRA property throughout the Bay area which have been in place for decades. As has been demonstrated by public space planners, dog owners and open space enthusiasts, restricting these areas to leash only space will only crowd municipal parks and reduce an important cultural, health and community activity for many Bay area residents.

Concern ID:

30539

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Implementing any new dog management will have more negative impacts than positive changes. The benefits to the environment would not be great as dogs have little impact on the environment currently. Any restriction would greatly hurt the users of the GGNRA who recreate with dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 463

Organization: Montara Dog Blog

Comment ID: 181741

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In summary, I would like to push for "Alternative A" to pass. The other alternatives are unfair to people and dogs who moved to these areas in hopes of having a life with greater access to outdoor resources. Changing the level of access to these areas is also inappropriate since many of the dogs who frequent the areas are incredibly active and may actually become problematic or aggressive around other dogs and around people if they are not exercised adequately. Finally, the environmental impact of dogs is insignificant and certainly less than that of horses, which are not being banned.

Corr. ID: 534

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181944

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Draft Dog Management Plan represents a disaster for dog owners in the bay area, effectively banning them from any meaningful interaction with the California coastline. I STRONGLY URGE you to DISMISS the draft policy and instead maintain the current policy or EXPAND the places to which dogs may enter.

Corr. ID: 1014

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191777

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a San Francisco resident and dog owner for over 50 years I feel strongly that the GGNRA should maintain the current amount of off

leash areas.

If the GGNRA wants to put its officers on the beaches and trails to cite those who are acting inappropriately that would be welcomed. It is more commonly observed that other people are damaging the habitat, not dogs.

I am not alone in feeling strongly that the status quo should be maintained.

Corr. ID: 1174 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193550 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While I understand and am in favor of rules/restrictions for each individual area, I am not in favor of a "no dog policy". To be completely dog restricted in these beautiful hiking/walking/beach areas we have available would not only be a sad burden for our pooch, but for myself and my husband as well. I am most in favor of the LEAST dog restrictive areas but at a minimum would consider the status quo and/or some additional dog restrictions on the most fragile of areas only.

Corr. ID: 3512 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201257 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This misguided "solution" to the problems of endangered wildlife would only cause larger problems for the City of San Francisco, crowding the city parks with people who can no longer exercise their companion animals in the GGNRA. People, dogs and wildlife have coexisted peacefully in these areas for over three decades, and can continue to do so under the current regulations. Thank you in advance for not changing the policy.

Corr. ID: 3737 **Organization:** SF Dog Owners Group

Comment ID: 204245 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the DEIS for major changes. I support formalization of 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in the current GGNRA and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.:

Concern ID: 30540

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The current management plan should be continued, as evidence to support a change in policy has not been provided. The data presented do not support the implementation of additional restrictions.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1587 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190812 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I will submit formal comments but I support no change to existing off-leash access for dog owners to Bay Area beaches.

The existing regs should protect sensitive dune and snowy plover areas. I am a responsible dog owner - pick up after my dog and respect restricted areas,

The proposed regulations do not make enough of a case that dog use will harm the environment.

These areas are urban recreation areas and not wildlife habitats.

Corr. ID: 1789 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200278 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge you to leave the 1979 Pet Policy in place. The report does not document the need to change a policy that was put into place that allowed the NPS to administer these lands. The GGNRA is different from most national parks, and hence a dog policy at GGNRA that is different from the rest of the properties in the NPS system is appropriate. The data provided from 2007 and 2008

show very few incidents of misbehavior, such as biting or harassing wildlife, by off leash dogs. The 1979 policy is working, and does not need to be changed.

Corr. ID: 2138 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193437 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no hard evidence of damages to the environment directly from off leash dog recreation - mostly from human use. Bird habitats are more affected by erosion or bulldozers trying to control erosion. Dog owners pay equal taxes & deserve recreation on park lands as well. Keep the voice control as it currently is.

Corr. ID: 3774 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205083 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Further, the proposed broad limitations in the DEIS are largely without site-specific science that demonstrates that the perceived degradation of the quality of the GGNRA's natural resources are actually attributable to dogs vs. other factors.

After careful consideration, I support a modified Alternative A (the "No Action alternative") and would also include the "New Lands" areas in San Mateo County.

Corr. ID: 4013 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206790 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At it's best, the plan is a weak and flawed attempt to address a very small number of issues within a much larger & required management plan regarding the GGNR. Disgracefully, the DDMP attempts to do so by restricting some of the GGNRA's most numerous users and generous supporters. Even worse, it uses biased and misleading scientific data in the attempt to support the plan. I strongly endorse that the 1979 GGNRA dog plan remain as is and in favor of Plan A (no change) for all areas/resources until a more comprehensive and inclusive EIS/management policy for the entire GGNRA is designed

Corr. ID: 4624 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208417 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly believe that multi-use open space that includes off-leash dog walking is compatible with all other recreational uses and with the preservation of habitat and wildlife within the GGNRA. In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement the National Park Service inappropriately singles out dogs. Its conclusions are not based upon sound science nor long-term monitoring of site-specific conditions.

The existing 1979 Pet Policy has served the community extremely well for more than 30 years. I strongly support Alternative A, the No Action alternative.

Concern ID:

30541

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Amid budgetary concerns, it is most sensible to maintain the current dog management in the GGNRA. Money spent implementing a new plan could be spent elsewhere on issues that are more important.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 557 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182031 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: That said, and under the circumstances of continued fiscal shortfalls for your budget, you and your organization would be best off in allowing the status quo to prevail...

Corr. ID: 2168 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200593 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Enforce the policies you have now instead of adding new ones that we don't need and can't afford. Let dogs run leash-free where they now do

and police parts of the recreational areas where they are supposed to be on leash or not at all. Enough tickets given out in the forbidden areas will convince the dog people to stick to the legal areas for leash-free dog fun. Clear signs designating the leash-free areas will also keep non-dog people from venturing into these areas. Do this and everyone can enjoy the magnificent GGNRA lands equally.

Corr. ID: 3295

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202855

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel that this whole process and its possible results are an affront to basic humanity, to co-existing in an urban environment. The approach of the National Park Service is underhanded and roundabout, with the obvious outcome of banning dogs entirely from these Recreational Areas.

That being said, I am writing today as a parent and dog owner. We go to Crissy Field pretty much every day of the year, rain or shine. The toddler and the dog run across the field, play on the beach, and on beautiful days romp and wade together in the channel that runs between the "estuary" and the bay. Should the "Proposed Changes" go through (in any permutation), most of that would be taken away from us. It is 100% unreasonable to expect that dogs be kept away from the channel area, barring putting up a fence around the whole area of beach that the channel might possibly meander to.

It is my request that NO CHANGES be made to the existing leash laws in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The funds that would be put into instituting the proposed changes would be much better spent towards enforcing the random wrong-doer than towards punishing each and every dog owner who has managed to peacefully coexist on these lands for almost 40 years. The Poison Pill clause that has made its way into your document (whereby if there are any transgressions then the leash laws can and will be further restricted) should be removed.

Please consider the area in which the NPS is trying to institute these changes. It is one of the most densely populated areas in the country, which is blessed with some beautiful open spaces and coastline. Should the GGNRA areas be made off limits to off-leash dog use, where are the dogs and their owners going to end up? In the cramped, fenced-in dog runs placed sporadically around San Francisco? Talk about setting us up for failure?

It is my fervent hope that our Recreational Areas remain untouched by the NPS's agenda.

Corr. ID: 3591

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203675

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am not a dog owner, but i do so enjoy being out on GGNRA beaches and watching the dogs running freely. It makes my heart soar to see such beautiful unbridled joy. This plan to eliminate 90% of the off-leash areas in San Francisco and Marin is terribly wrong and short-sighted. From what i'm told, these areas in dispute were promised as off-leash areas when the land was transferred to the GGNRA back in 1972. Where are these dogs and their dog owners supposed to go? You must allow dogs to run off-leash! This is a city, with limited outdoor recreational land, and you must respect the recreational needs of its inhabitants. I respectfully request you leave things as they are, and spend your limited funds on more pressing concerns.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

30625

The current regulations should not only be adopted, they should be codified as a Section Seven Special Regulation to prevent further changes in policy, and to

- Representative Quote(s):* **Corr. ID:** 2808 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 201104 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am strongly in favor of keeping the GGNRA open to dogs and off-leash dog walking. I implore the GGNRA to stop pushing its extreme proposal that will negatively impact tens of thousands of tax-paying and voting residents living in San Francisco and Marin. I understand that Congress could resolve this conflict by codifying the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation, and mandating that all properties added to the GGNRA after 1979 maintain historical recreational access. Please do NOT eliminate or restrict dogs or off-leash dog walking in San Francisco or Marin.
- Corr. ID:** 4126 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208550 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The public would best be served by institution of the 1979 Pet Policy to include new land acquisitions as the Section 7 Special Regulation for the GGNRA.
- Corr. ID:** 4232 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208577 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Off-leash recreation should be INCREASED in the GGNRA, I throw my support behind the status quo = the 1979 Pet Policy. Just formalize it with a Section 7 and move on to a REAL ISSUE, not this manufactured one.
- Concern ID:** 30626
CONCERN STATEMENT: The justification for the new preferred alternative of bringing the GGNRA in line with other NPS properties is not enough of a reason to restrict dog walking in the park, so the current restrictions should be continued, as stated in the original mandate. The GGNRA is within a large urban area, making it unique from many other NPS properties.
- Representative Quote(s):* **Corr. ID:** 4016 **Organization:** San Francisco resident
Comment ID: 206843 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I believe the system in-place is working (on many levels) and could work better if smaller, more localized strategies were undertaken to preserve cultural resources, landscape and wildlife habitats. Simply reducing the cherished dog-walking areas, throughout the Bay area for the sake of corresponding to Federal guidelines, is a waste of the positive efforts of the GGNRA.
- Corr. ID:** 4048 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207343 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: compliance with (36 CFR 2.15) is not a valid motivation for a change from the 1979 Dog Management Plan. The GGNRA is *not* a National Park, it is a National Recreational Area. The existing practices prior to the area becoming a GGNRA and the 1979 provisions along with the existing endangered species provisions are adequate for the mixed use of the recreation area.
- Corr. ID:** 4234 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208592 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The GGNRA was designed as an urban recreation area that can accommodate both recreation and conservation, and that the existing 1979 pet policy should not be altered. The citizens of San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo Counties have shown that they support the existing pet policy, and it has been upheld by the courts, as the existing pet policy is consistent with the original mandate for recreation upon which the GGNRA was founded.

Concern ID: 30627

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters suggested that the current management is sufficient, but included several suggestions for additions to the current management to improve it. These suggestions included improving signage and enforcement, as well as making all new lands or more space than is currently available open to off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195374 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe that restricting and prohibiting off-leash dogs in so many GGNRA lands is not the solution to the perceived problem--rather, if there are issues with dogs on these lands (which I don't agree is the case), then the solution is better enforcement of current rules.

Corr. ID: 3212 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202527 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned about the proposed changes to the GGNRA. I believe off-leash dog activity in the GGNRA is essential to the well-being of both dogs and humans. Dogs get needed exercise which keeps them well-behaved and these particular off-leash areas allow for unique and healthy human social interactions.

I have become familiar with the proposed GGNRA changes. I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I would like to see the Park Service revise the dog management plan to retain and formalize the existing GGNRA dog policy (aka the 1979 Pet Policy) plus provide for balanced off-leash areas in San Mateo County and new lands and remove any proposed rules to reduce or ban dog recreation based only on violations; compliance-based management strategy cannot be part of any plan.

I would like a revised plan to measure the impact of dog recreation on the health and well-being of people. I would like to see disadvantaged groups and others able to provide unfiltered comments on their preferences and barriers to using the GGNRA. I, also, believe the GGNRA should provide better signage and that a revised plan should include awareness programs.

Corr. ID: 3500 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201182 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not agree with the GGNRA's 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.

The proposed "compliance-based" 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.

After careful consideration, I support a modified Alternative A (the "No Action alternative") and would also include the "New Lands" areas in San Mateo County. The current plan should be modified to provide clearer rules, more signage, improved vegetative barriers, and education and outreach as part of the overall program.

Corr. ID: 3533 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201288 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is essential for the GGNRA to consider reasonable and balanced alternatives for dog walking on new lands and existing lands. While I am concerned about the long-term preservation of the GGNRA's natural resources and want to protect these important natural areas, I believe other options (besides restricting dog-walking access) should be considered first. I favor an approach that balances recreational use (including dog-walking access) with preservation. I think that a multi-faceted approach that incorporates education/improved signage and physical/vegetative barriers is preferable to restriction as a first choice. It is imperative that the DEIS include such an alternative as a reasonable option.

I support a modified Alternative A (the "No Action alternative") and would also include the "New Lands" areas in San Mateo County. The current plan should be modified to provide clearer rules, more signage, improved vegetative barriers, and education and outreach as part of the overall program.

Corr. ID: 3640

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204093

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not agree with the GGNRA's 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.

I favor an approach that balances recreational use (including dog-walking access) with preservation. I think that a multi-faceted approach that incorporates education/improved signage and physical/vegetative barriers is preferable to restriction as a first choice. It is imperative that the DEIS include such an alternative as a reasonable option.

The proposed "compliance-based" 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.

The DEIS fails to consider that the GGNRA is the front/back yard for a large metropolitan area. The fundamental purpose of creating the GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) for residents of the Bay Area. 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.

After careful consideration, I support a modified Alternative A (the "No Action alternative") and would also include the "New Lands" areas in San Mateo County. The current plan should be modified to provide clearer rules, more signage, improved vegetative barriers, and education and outreach as part of the overall program.

Corr. ID: 4088

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208343

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Hybrid Alternative, includes the 1979 Pet Policy (Alternative A: No Action-existing conditions), include the New Lands, and the implementation of management measures, which include but are not limited to more, better and clearer signage, a robust educational program that would include partnering with local animal welfare groups such as the San Francisco SPCA, Marin Humane Society and the Peninsula Humane/SPCA at a minimum. Other measures include the use of environmental or vegetative barriers, and low-level post and cable fencing to protect a plant species such as the blue lupine. I also support the creation of a "recreation team or panel" who can assist the GGNRA

with issues regarding all recreational visitors in a public forum on a quarterly basis.

GC4000 - General Comment: Continue to allow dogs within GGNRA

Concern ID: 29758

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Being able to walk dogs in the GGNRA is a valuable part of the experience of many visitors. GGNRA access improves the health and well-being of visitors, who rely on this resource to get exercise. Access to the GGNRA for visitors with dogs must be allowed.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 356 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181134 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not take away any hikes that currently allow dogs. If anything, we need to add more! Hiking with one's dog is a great way for individuals to get physical activity while also exercising their dogs.

Corr. ID: 388 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181176 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: PLEASE, PLEASE let the dogs be !!!!!

Dogs and their owners need exercise and should be able to utilize the GGNRA like everyone else

Corr. ID: 1110 **Organization:** SF Resident Voter

Comment ID: 192298 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Without proper exercise and space to release energy and socialize, our dogs will develop many physical and behavioral problems. The proposed Dog Management Plan is unfairly restrictive to dog owners, and does not match or serve the needs of the surrounding community. The community can only be served by having more urban parks and more open space, not less. We should oppose the federal government's position of eliminating the "recreation" from OUR parks and territories. If it's not broke, than don't fix it.

Corr. ID: 3992 **Organization:** John Muir Health

Comment ID: 207423 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am an executive at John Muir Health in Contra Costa County. Please reconsider your "Dog Management Plan." Taking hikes, etc. with the family dog is a very valuable opportunity of exercise and social contact. Your proposal to ban such activities I feel significantly diminishes opportunities for improving the health and well-being of our population.

Concern ID: 29759

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Restricting dogs from the park will not provide protection of resources in the GGNRA, and will significantly affect those visitors that enjoy having dogs at the park. Restricting dog will also cause problems at other areas that allow dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 556 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182029 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Our dog is part of the family, and for him to have this experience outside in such a beautiful city is invaluable to us. I strongly believe dogs and wildlife can co-exist, that dog owners can be responsible to pick up after their dogs, control their dogs, and that people, dogs and environment can all be a part of the same outdoor space and respect it at the same time.

Corr. ID: 1603 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190841 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned that prof. dog walkers will (already are) move into McLaren Park. Its getting to the point where I can't walk my own dogs...Please don't close these GGNRA areas!! There isn't enough open space for

dogs as it is.

Corr. ID: 3804

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208423

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think the GGNRA should keep its promises to San Franciscans like me. The GGNRA promised to keep the access to dogs and their owners as they stood when they were GIVEN our CITY land.

If dog off leash areas are taken away and dog friendly areas are taken away, our dogs are still going to have to be exercised causing congestion and frustrated dogs and owners in neighborhoods.

Please keep your promises. Please keep Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Crissy Field, and all other access areas available to all San Franciscans, and their pets.

Corr. ID: 3834

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209307

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The current proposals to restrict my access to ocean front property in San Francisco is beyond comprehension. I understand the need to protect natural resources, but excluding me and my dogs from Fort Funston doesn't accomplish that goal

Concern ID:

29760

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There are already not enough places in the Bay Area where people can visit with their dogs, including in state parks, and the GGNRA is already too restrictive. The areas open to dogs in the GGNRA should remain open to dogs. It would be unfair to remove access to this resource.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 582

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182101

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not further reduce the available area that dog owners have to let their dogs run and play off leash. Dog owners are finding it increasingly difficult to find open spaces where their pets can exercise.

Corr. ID: 3223

Organization: Bad Girls Book Club, NCIWC, Indigo Piping Systems

Comment ID: 202610

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As an avid dog lover who loves the outdoors, I find that the GGNRA is already far too restrictive of dogs in the Parks. For example, we don't feel we can bring our dog to Pt Reyes because of the excessive dog rules, so we often just don't go. Alternatively, we love bringing our dogs to Pt Isabel in Richmond. Dog owners are very appreciative of a chance to exercise in a beautiful area. I see the vast majority do pick up after their dogs and are considerate of other people. Our dogs are giant breed dogs and, even in off leash areas, I always leash my dogs when I see the elderly or toddlers approaching for their safety. (Our dogs are gentle giants, but could accidentally knock a frail person over.)

Please do not further restrict the chances for us to visit parks with our beloved companions.

Corr. ID: 3698

Organization: San Francisco Dog

Comment ID: 204818

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is very wrong for the government to take away the right of dog owners to have access to the system of parks and open spaces where they can bring their dog to exercise and run free when it is not infringing on anyone else. I have visited Fort Funston many times and the dogs there are well behaved and under control of their owners and dog walkers. There are only dog people walking

in that area with a few other sight seers who love the dogs. The open land is supposed to be for the people to enjoy not for the officials to take away. It is for recreational use of the people who live in city areas. The government is supposed to be for the people, it is paid by the people, and should be answerable to the people. Do not take away our rightful recreational property. Do not turn against those things that have been entrusted to you as public servants for the people of this area.

Corr. ID: 4259 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209161 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It's bad enough the state doesn't allow dogs in all of their parks(except the parking lot and restricted paved areas). PLEASE DON'T bar dogs from national recreation areas too. We won't have anywhere we can go. If you're worried that off leash dogs will molest wildlife - have a leash requirement JUST IN THOSE AREAS. People who love the outdoors love their dogs too. The number of parks that accepts dogs is too limited. If you're arguing that dogs make a mess - look at Baker Beach, which is very clean. All you need to do is provide enough trash cans and bags.

Concern ID:

29761

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[Dogs should not be banned from the parks in the GGNRA. It would negatively impact dog owners and other park users if dogs were not allowed in the GGNRA.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2987 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203669 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan and "all action alternatives" that further reduce or ban dogs. Please keep our open spaces dog-friendly and plentiful. The Park Service should revise the dog management plan to:

- Recognize dog recreation as a safe and healthy recreational activity and as important to the health and well-being of people, dogs, and communities, especially those in densely populated urban areas

- Justify any changes with objective, reasonable scientific studies and findings and remove the many exaggerations, speculations, and misleading statements. Don't treat dog recreation as a hazard and nuisance despite facts to the contrary; it's compatible with other urban recreation

My boyfriend and I recently moved to the Outer Richmond specifically to be close to Ocean Beach. We have a 3 year old Husky who needs the open spaces such as Ocean Beach and Ft. Fuston for exercise. Just as we both place high importance on our own fitness, it is equally as important for Scando. It would be a travesty if beach and other recreation privileges were taken away for our canine friends. Please do not ban the dogs.

Corr. ID: 3002 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200823 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: When I go running in Spring Lake Park, I bring my dog partially for protection--and will not enter the park for a run without him. Before you punish responsible pet owners, like myself, I would encourage you to do an indepth study of the effects that banning dogs from the parks would have on all involved. I have not read one compelling reason to ban dogs from the parks and feel that it is the effort of a few people who do not like or understand dogs. Please do not sign such a wide-stretching ban without a more indepth study to be fair to all involved.

GC4010 - General Comment: Ban all dogs from GGNRA

Concern ID: 29763

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dogs should not be allowed at all in the GGNRA. Dogs are not allowed in state parks, open spaces, and other national parks, and keeping the GGNRA in line with these policies makes sense for resource protection and enforcement.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 67 **Organization:** Self
Comment ID: 181812 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dogs should not be allowed in any National Park, National Seashore, National Monument, or National Recreation Area.

Corr. ID: 1091 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192230 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: BAN THE DOGS. Here's why.
Dogs that go off leash violate the core purpose of the GGNRA by harming wildlife and wrecking the park experience for the large majority of other visitors. We do not have the funds for the level of enforcement that would ensure dog owners obey ANY leash laws. Even though it is only "some" of the dogs there are enough problem ones, and the damage THEY cause is large enough, that the only affordable way to prevent that damage is to ban the dogs.

Corr. ID: 2345 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202163 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Urine drenched sand, fecal debris is not how the GGNRA can protect the environmental integrity and beauty of our shoreline. It is harmful to wildlife and people. The Dog Management Draft Plan does not propose enough protection.

Please, expand the vision. Dogs OFF the beach, better enforcement of leash laws, MORE NO DOGS PERMITTED places for people to walk, relax, bird, play and enjoy our natural resource. No dogs in the National Parks. Enforce it and make it happen

Corr. ID: 3902 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 205554 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Our national parks should provide the best possible visitor experience for people, not dogs. Dogs and wildlife do not mix. Dogs should generally be banned from national parks, national recreation areas, etc. If they are allowed, the areas should be limited to reduce conflict with wildlife and they should always be on a leash to reduce conflict with other visitors. Please ban dogs from the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, or at a minimum, require leashes and only allow dogs in limited areas.

Corr. ID: 4024 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207018 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: It is simplest and ultimately best to follow the example of the Peninsula Open Space and many other federal lands, which is to prohibit dogs in most areas. It will be too difficult for the NPS to enforce complicated and subtle rules. Too many owners have a sense of entitlement at the peril of the world around them, and until our pet culture changes to one of consideration, dogs should not be allowed to run unleashed on GGNRA lands. This may be a case of where a few bad handlers ruin the situation for everyone else, but in my copious experience, it is on every occasion I venture out that I witness a dog destroying habitat or interfering with a citizen's peaceful enjoyment of the land.

Corr. ID: 4547 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209738 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In closing, I am hoping that you will prohibit dogs from entering the Golden Gate Park National Recreation Area. National Parks, county parks and state parks do not allow dogs and I feel that dogs should not be allowed at Mori Point either.

Concern ID:

29764

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Dogs negatively influence the wildlife and the experience and safety of visitors at the GGNRA. For this reason they should not be allowed in the parks. No dogs is the easiest way to protect these resources and provide clear rules.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2339

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195391 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are just too many dogs in urban areas, and too many irresponsible dog owners everywhere. Please do what you can to prevent dogs from our parks and public areas for those of us who pay taxes and fees to have a nice walk in the park, not stepping in smelly dog poop, nor being hassled by rowdy, mean dogs that run into and bump up against us on the trails.

Corr. ID: 2529

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200754 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please -- no dogs! If they're allowed, old people, blind people, and disabled people are as good as banned. I've been attacked so often in my city parks in San Francisco by dogs whose owners are nowhere to be seen that I've given up going to parks I used to frequent. Don't let that happen in the GGNRA.

Also, it's been proved by study that dogs have an even worse impact on wildlife than previous thought, by the University of Utah. Here's a link to a Daily Mail piece about a study in the "Bioscience" journal

Corr. ID: 2891

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202971 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One problem is the domination of parks and open spaces by dogs. Please remove dogs from our open spaces and parks and make them safe and welcoming for people of all ages. We should not have to worry about dog feces, urine, and pets running wild and terrorizing our children

Corr. ID: 2961

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203458 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I thoroughly support restrictions on dogs in GGNRA.

A few months ago, while on a walk on the Miwok trail, nearing the coast trail, I came across a young woman who was a professional dog walker.

She had 10 large dogs in her care and all of them were running unleashed right in the midst of a no dog sign! One of the dogs jumped up on me and knocked me down. When I pushed the dog off of me, I went to check it's tag to see if I might be able to alert it's owner. The dog walker became belligerent and threatened to hit me! It was an unpleasant and totally unnecessary encounter. I see this aggression mounting more and more.

I have numerous encounters with dogs on the trail that are unpleasant, sometimes as simple as a muddy dog jumping up on me or 2 dogs suddenly wildly barking at each other.

At Rodeo Beach dog owner flock to the beach to let their dogs run free, chasing birds and other wildlife. The owner have with no regard for other people who simply wish to enjoy nature as it is.

These dogs are running wild, tearing up the fragile plant life and hunting for quail and other wildlife. We have a precious resource of wildlife and a natural setting that is getting eroded by domestic pets. Pet owners need to consider responsible care for their environment and not assume that the parks are there for their exclusive use.

I would like to see a NO DOGS ALLOWED rule that is actively enforced.

I would even be willing to help out with the enforcement.

Corr. ID: 3262 **Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association

Comment ID: 202773 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a dog lover and owner, I am writing to urge the Park Service to take stronger actions to control the access of dogs to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We dog owners have many places that we can take our dogs that do not threaten or endanger wildlife. We don't have to take them with us when we want to enjoy the GGNRA and its beaches. The future of wildlife is far more important than the enjoyment that dog owners get from having their pets with them. It's time to put a leash on scofflaw dog owners!

GC5000 - On-leash dogs: Support

Concern ID: 29865

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters supported on-leash dog walking, and felt there should be little or no restriction to the areas where on-leash dog walking is allowed.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 186 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182298 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In short, allow on leash access, increase the areas open to responsible dog owners, and eliminate off leash access altogether.

Corr. ID: 3095 **Organization:** Self

Comment ID: 203089 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: (1) On lease dog walking should be allowed in the vast majority of areas -- with a very limited area designated for people who don't even want on least dogs in the same area;

(2) Off leash dogs be allowed anywhere that their presence is not likely to cause material environmental damage (such as beaches), with limited portions of those areas (or times) being designated "no off leash dog" to accommodate people who don't want to be faced with off leash dogs;

Corr. ID: 4114 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208495 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a responsible dog owner and on-leash proponent, I was shocked to learn that the "preferred alternatives" to GGNRA land would drastically limit on leash dog access.

Concern ID: 29867

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dogs in national parks or public areas should be leashed. Having dogs on-leash in national parks is more in line with NPS policy.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 632 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182499 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There should NOT be ANY "off leash" areas in ANY

property under NPS control.

GGNRA should not be any different than any other National Park, nor any other urban NPS facilities.

Corr. ID: 785 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186007 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: all dogs should be on leash at all times when in public areas.

Corr. ID: 1046 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192126 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It's about time that Golden Gate complies with NPS policy!! Dogs should have always been allowed ON LEASH ONLY in certain areas.

Corr. ID: 1915 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192594 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog walking should be on leash on public sidewalks, not in National Parks, unless a specific trail is rated for on leash dogs. Every town should have a few dog parks, where dogs may run free- but not in the national parks.

Corr. ID: 2058 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200512 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a regular volunteer at the Presidio Park and am concerned about the Dog Management Plan for our National Parks. I strongly believe that all dogs should be on a leash and all times while in our National Parks.

Concern ID:

29925

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Keeping dogs on-leash is safer for the dogs themselves, but also for owners and other visitors. Having dogs on-leash greatly reduces health-related incidents between users.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 25 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204161 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) Nobody can control the fear of others, but we can enforce leash laws that allow owners to control their dogs, even if the dog does not respond to voice control. I have encountered people who are morbidly afraid of dogs, either through personal experience, irrational fear, or cultural learnings. The solution is simple: I simply move my dog to one side and place myself between the dog and the person

Corr. ID: 1307 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195044 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs need to be leashed in a enviroment where others (dogs and humans) share. There is too much room for mishap when they run wild. As I said before I am a dog owner and walker and I have no problem what so ever walking my dogs on leash.

Corr. ID: 2063 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200503 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support a leash law for the GGNRA.

I frequent the parks of the GGNRA with my 7 year old son. Numerous times we have been confronted by off-leash dogs while enjoying the park. It is not comforting for a dog owner to say, "she won't bite" or "he's harmless" because even the most well behaved dogs can be unpredictable. I want to enjoy my time in the park, not worry about dogs.

The National Parks are for all to enjoy and are not for dogs to run free. There are dog parks or other open areas for dogs. The National Parks are delicate lands that we should protect. The human impact is already causing enough damage to these natural areas. We don't need off-leash dogs tramping through protected lands.

Please keep dogs on leashes in our parks!

Corr. ID: 2944

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203423

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Having recently been set upon by an unleashed dog in the Presidio as I walked by the dog and owner on a paved road, I would like to say that any policy that does not require ALL dogs (whether nice, darling, or just plain mean, untrained, and uncontrolled) to be leashed in the park areas endangers those of us taxpayers who walk on your paths. I now understand why I see people my age (over 65) carrying golf clubs when they are on foot in your precincts and nowhere near a golf course. I certainly wish I had been carrying one when the dog in question decided to assault me.

I'm sure you know more than I do about the dog manure issue arising from dog use of the park. But from my observation this is a problem you should address.

Corr. ID: 3629

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204109

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my support for developing and adopting regulations that will require dogs to be restrained by leash while in Golden Gate Recreation Area.

As a professional dog trainer and free lance writer, I have written on the importance of leashes for the management and protection of dogs. Maintaining dogs safely on leash is vital for the health and safety of humans using the recreation area, wildlife and the dog. Loose dogs can and will pose a risk to visitors in the Recreation Area. A dog jumping on, chasing, startling or even playfully nipping at a runner, rider or cyclist can cause a wide range of injuries. Dogs will chase wildlife and cause damage, disturb natural behavior, injury and potentially death. Wildlife poses a variety of health and safety risks to unleashed dogs. In my region, coyotes have attacked small, unleashed dogs in local parks. There are multiple parasites and diseases that can be transmitted to domestic dogs and the dogs can pass on to humans. It is vital that dogs be restrained with a leash when walking in public areas. However, many owners ignore leash laws. Even in national parks where there is a law requiring all dogs to be on a lead no more than six feet in length, I see constant violations.

If there are designated off leash areas in the vicinity, then dog owners should be directed there. If not, then creating a designated and fully fenced off lead area is a suggestion I would pose. Adopt leash regulations and create a dog-specific area where they can run off lead.

Corr. ID: 4475

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209394

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel very strongly that dogs must be on leashes in areas used by the public. The dogs run freely and are aggressive. It is a fundamental safety issue for the rest of us to be able to walk there without fear of being jumped on and frightened.

Concern ID:

29927

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

When dogs are on-leash it allows for multiple user groups to co-exist in the GGNRA. Having dogs on-leash benefits visitors who are either afraid of dogs, or

Representative Quote(s): [do not want to be approached by them in the GGNRA.](#)
Corr. ID: 521 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181939 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: If you allow dogs access in all areas, you would be ignoring the needs of others, such as birdwatchers, hikers and parties who just want to commune with nature. Dogs might be ok in certain less sensitive areas if they are ON LEASH.
Corr. ID: 575 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182080 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: To be honest, my preference would be to ban dogs altogether from our parks. However, I do understand how important dogs are to many people, and the great pleasure they take in having their dog accompany them on the trails. To me, the requirement that a dog is on leash is a reasonable compromise between dog owners and dog dislikers. While I don't love a dog on leash when I encounter him, at least I do not feel threatened. If we must have a place where dogs go off leash, let's have a specific place, well sign-posted, such that people like me can simply avoid it.
Corr. ID: 2251 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200994 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In order to share space with other visitors, dog owners need to put their dogs on leash at all times in all places that allow dogs. When dogs are off leash, the space becomes a "special use area." Therefore, there should be no off leash dog areas.
Corr. ID: 4026 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207084 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: For those that do have voice control:

ROLAs option, my recommendation would be to have access limited and restricted to dawn-8 a.m. and 5 p.m. - dusk (or 4 p.m. until dusk during PST).

Another ROLAs option would be to have a similar policy that was instituted in 1979's advisory commission for Marin County's Whitegate Ranch. That policy allowed for an Advanced Dog Training Area where use is restricted to owners and dogs that have successfully completed basic obedience training and are in process of advanced obedience or special skills training (i.e. search and rescue, etc).

On-leash

During the other times I strongly recommend an on-leash dog policy. We share this open space with hikers, birders, children, bikers, seniors, and wildlife. Everyone can enjoy this amazing environment if dogs are on leash or if people have the voice control for the ROLA option.

Concern ID: 29928
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Enforcement of the rules is easier when dogs are on-leash. This saves the park money, time, and preserves park resources. Having on-leash dog walking as the rule also helps to deter most dog walkers from non-compliance.](#)
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2288 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 201167 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: How can we afford law enforcement in the parks to make sure owners of dogs are keeping their animals under voice control, at least if they are required to be on a leash, other owners will remind those breaking the law to do the right thing

Corr. ID: 2882 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202914 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Anything other than a ban or a leash requirement is impossible to enforce, and those are the only fair and reasonable alternatives.

Corr. ID: 3390 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203134 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a docent in an Urban National Park (Franklin Canyon - Santa Monica Mountain National Recreation Area), I can tell you from experience that dogs off-leash, represent a real threat to wildlife and to other park users. Even when there is an on-leash rule, there is still a problem as it is often ignored, but it is still a significant deterrent.

Corr. ID: 4261 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209155 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Most of all, rules are only as good as their enforcement, and in times of budget cuts, we are always looking to save money and that might mean less enforcers of the rules on Federal lands. Please enforce ON LEASH rules for the public safety and for the wildlife in these beautiful areas. This not to mention the annoyance of stepping in dog poop as you hike down a rustic trail.

Concern ID:

29929

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Many dog owners do not truly have voice control over their dogs, and many dogs are not easily controlled under voice control when there is wildlife or other distractions around. Many dog walkers also do not seem to take care in dealing with the waste and other impacts from dogs to wildlife, other visitors, and resources. Having dogs on-leash would lessen these problems, and improve the experience at the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 238 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180783 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I value California native species and habitats. I do not feel that dog walkers have the right to let their dogs run uncontrolled in these areas.

Voice control is NOT control. Enclosed areas would be acceptable for off-leash dog running.

I value children and people who are either disabled or fearful of uncontrolled dogs. That is another reason dogs need to be leashed.

Perhaps some owners clean up after their dogs. Unfortunately, a lot do not; and because of those unconscious people we have to deal with contamination in scenic areas. Another reason to keep dogs on leash.

Personally, I am tired of the strident demands of the dog owners and walkers. They are but one small but too vocal group.

For all the reasons above, I completely support the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan.

Corr. ID: 338 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181109 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the plan and wish NPS well in its attempt to protect GGNRA.

Dogs need to be controlled to protect wildlife and visitors. Voice control means

many things to many people and the bottom line is that voice control is ineffective in crucial situations. If a dog is to be allowed on NPS property it must be on a leash six feet or shorter with the other end of the leash held by a person at all times -- even service dogs

Corr. ID: 1787 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200270 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support on-leash dog-walking generally, and I always keep my dog on a leash when she isn't fenced in at home or at a dog park. I feel that many people who claim their dog is under "voice control" merely have a dog that will come when called most of the time. To me, true voice control is reserved for professional dogs, such as police canine units, and obedience champions. I worry that most off-leash dogs will ignore their owners in a stressful situation, where voice control would be most needed. Examples could be: Encounters with a wild animal, two intact males who suddenly decide to fight over a nearby female, or a dog who misreads the actions of child as that of a puppy who needs discipline. In any of these situations, I think even well-trained dogs might ignore their training.

Corr. ID: 3644 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204116 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think dogs should be required to be on a leash at all times. While a dog may be under voice command most of the time, if it gets excited chasing a bird for example, it probably won't be.

Corr. ID: 4642 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208830 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog impact on wildlife and vegetation - are simply managed by keeping dogs on the trails, under control, either on leash or under voice control as currently allowed. Most difficulties arise when dogs are off leash and the owner does not have true control ("control" is defined as being able to consistently call your dog to your side even when there is something they would rather do). Unfortunately few dog owners have this level of voice control. When hiking, I myself, am often frustrated by the need to intercede when another dog approaches while the owner makes futile attempts to call their dog.

Training to achieve this level of control is possible but does not come easily; without it, dogs should remain on leash. Enforcing leash restrictions where they currently exist would address nearly all of the dog-related concerns. For those areas where dogs are currently allowed off leash, I would argue that we need a better means of identifying those individuals who understand the concept of voice control.

Concern ID: 29930

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having dogs on-leash in the park provides better protection to natural resources. Having dogs on-leash lessens the impact of dogs on wildlife, native vegetation, and threatened and endangered species.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2437 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200767 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please develop a management plan for GGNRA that requires dogs to be kept on leashes. Dogs are great pets, but dog owners must understand that their unconstrained presence in a wild area disturbs and endangers wildlife there.

Corr. ID: 2970 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203666 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs belong on a leash. In order to give the widest range of interests the ability to share the park, dogs belong on a leash. Dogs cause

significant environmental disruption when allowed to run freely. Not only that but, many people are afraid of dogs, and allowing the dogs free access to the park will essentially bar these same people from also enjoying the park.

We instituted the park system to protect the wildlife there, allowing off-leash dogs is counter to that protection.

Corr. ID: 3817 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204876 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I frequently visit GGNR areas with my dog and really appreciate having beautiful spaces to take a dog. I always keep her on leash and have never encountered an off-leash dog that was aggressive. Still, for the sake of preserving fragile habitats, I would support requiring all dogs be on leash, and perhaps limiting the number of dogs per visitor to ensure that they can be under full human control at all times (which would mean commercial dog walkers would reduce their use of the parks.)

I encourage the committee to consider options that would still allow visitors to bring 1-2 leashed dogs into GGNR areas.

Corr. ID: 4275 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209088 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have lived near the Presidio for over 30 years and utilize Baker Beach, Lake St. Park, Crissy Field, the hidden trails of the Presidio and the Marin Headlands at least once per week -

I encourage GGNRA to re-strict and regulate trails for dogs. They should always be on leash in these areas. I have seen dogs near seals on the beach. I am greatly concerned about the wildlife in the GGNRA. Dogs should be on leash and there should be designated areas for the dogs.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

29934

Dogs can still be happily walked and enjoy their time while on-leash. Because of this, on-leash dog walking is a good option.

Corr. ID: 959 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191590 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Mind you- I don't hate dogs. I know they can be walked and run with on-leash-happily for both dog and owner. I've done it.

But keep them on leash in public. This is the law and it's about public safety.

Corr. ID: 1113 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192352 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am all for requiring dogs to be on leash in the GGNRA outside of enclosed special areas for the protection of the wildlife as well as safety and sanitary issues. I am a longtime dog owner and have had no problem taking good care of them, all happy healthy and long lived, without allowing them to run around willy nilly in national park areas

The balance would be to add some more, and good quality in good locations, enclosed dog parks and let people walk with dogs on leash in natural areas - this way there will be places for dogs to play and you can still enjoy walking around the beautiful areas with your canine buddy.

Corr. ID: 3634 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204546 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I want to STRESS that I do now and have owned dogs for

the last 30 years and like them very much. But I can honestly say that I always have put them on the leash during my hikes. Dogs are incredibly adaptable. Once they know the routine they enjoy trotting alongside their owner(s) perfectly happily, getting the necessary exercise and enjoying their outing. They do not need to be put in situations where they can bother others or disrupt people enjoying the beach. The same goes for their chasing wildlife. If something moves, a dog will chase it. We all know that. I have seen dogs running after very small fawns, for example, and at times catching sea birds.

Concern ID: 29935

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Having dogs on-leash will encourage more exercise for visitors and improve overall health.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1412 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195349 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One way of getting humans to exercise more would be to require leashes everywhere in the GGNRA. This would mean that if the owner wants the dog to get exercise, the owner would most likely have to get exercise. (or get a dog walker). At the moment, I observe dog owners sitting or standing in the park and not getting aerobic exercise while there dogs are wandering all over the park often off of voice control. Furthermore, dogs on leash would also allow people who have avoided the parks due to off leash dogs to get exercise as well. Overall, leash requirements would improve human health by increasing human exercise.

GC6000 - On-leash Dogs: Oppose

Concern ID: 29846

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Dogs on-leash are more likely to be aggressive towards people and other dogs. On-leash dogs are more likely to get frustrated and feel more protective of their owners, which can cause aggression](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 7 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181410 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please, please, please do not implement this plan. The dogs learn social skills and are able to interact much easier off leash. On leash, dogs become protective, often leading to altercations; the best way to avoid this is to keep the parks the way they've always been.

Corr. ID: 4340 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209476 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On leash, Ozzie feels as though he needs to protect us. This makes him occasionally act aggressively toward passing dogs, and is the complete opposite of how playful he is when he's off leash. When Ozzie's on leash it's not a relaxing experience for either of us.

Concern ID: 29849

CONCERN STATEMENT: [It is difficult for some visitors, particularly those that are disabled or elderly, to adequately control their dogs on-leash. Having dogs on-leash also limits the exercise dogs can obtain to the exercise abilities of their owners, which may not be sufficient.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3399 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203140 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A leash rule may be an easy answer but it is far from fair

or right. The nature of the experience with the dogs off-leash - in which we are letting the dogs socialize, run, play, etc. - fosters a type of camaraderie that is increasingly rare in today's society, and it would be a great loss to our community were it to become unavailable. A small minority of owners may not be as responsible as they need to be, but to deny all dogs the opportunity to run free is unconscionable. They simply cannot get enough exercise if they are always leashed. When the rights of some are restricted, it is called discrimination. How can it be that a few people can disallow the many access to a public space and restrict their freedom? When one space becomes restricted what's to stop the spread of restriction?

I am angry over how discriminated against we dog owners are. What other group is consistently labeled by the actions of a few?

Corr. ID: 4317 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209413 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to comment on the rush to judgment proposed in the new guidelines restricting off-leash access to the GGNRA. Rather than formalizing the 1979 Pet Policy, the proposed new regulations are draconian in their scope.

No concern appears to have been shown for those of us, whose main recreation is walking with our dogs in the GGNRA. Elderly dog owners and many others cannot adequately exercise their dogs while the dogs are on leash

Corr. ID: 4540 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209779 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA site at Fort Funston allows me and so many other urban residents the recreation that we need. Having increasing mobility problems, I try to walk frequently and purposefully as often as I can, and the hike from the Fort Funston parking area to the on-leash-from-here sign to the north (I don't know the name of that area; there is a lovely bench where one can fully relax for awhile and enjoy the view) makes a perfect distance. I do know, however, that I would not want to take that walk with two or three of my dogs on leash. I have large dogs, and at 10 1/2, 9, and 2 1/2 years old, their walking paces and needs are very different, and walking two or three of them on leash for a distance would be quite uncomfortable for me.

Concern ID:

29855

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Leashing dogs would not solve or address many of the issues caused by dogs in the GGNRA, including issues with waste and other environmental impacts. It is unlikely that requiring dogs to be on-leash would result in any changes. Many visitors would ignore the on-leash regulations, and it would be hard to enforce these rules.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1860 **Organization:** Self

Comment ID: 209623 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In summary, I request and recommend that off-leash policies not be impacted but rather address the direct concerns of dog feces and environmental damage with stiff fines for violators. Both issues can not be corrected by leashing a dog so let's correct the behavior of the irresponsible minority by citing violators.

Corr. ID: 2136 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193432 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Any Natural Resource Area where the potential for significant impacts from allowing dogs off-leash exists should be excluded from

dog use, period. Allowing on-leash dog use in these areas requires constant monitoring to ensure that dogs are not released off-leash. Such oversight and enforcement is unlikely without an increase of ranger patrols which, in the past have been practically non-existent.

Corr. ID: 3754 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204259 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It would be ideal to keep dogs out of all biologically sensitive areas, which includes almost every site on the list. This includes leashed dogs if only because their owners often ignore the leash once in situ.

Concern ID: 29857

CONCERN STATEMENT: Having to walk dogs on-leash would have negative impacts on the experiences of some visitors in the GGNRA. Some visitors may not enjoy having dogs present on-leash. Alternately, others may feel that having to keep their dogs on-leash lessens the experience of the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1673 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191072 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If my dogs were on-leash - one I wouldn't be inclined to use the park and the park should be for the public for everyone to use. I wouldn't have to stay in my apt. or be relegated to using only the dog parks.

-Also, if the dogs are on leash - I - ME = I = Don't get to take in or appreciate the beauty of the park.

Corr. ID: 3701 **Organization:** Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Comment ID: 202230 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Leashed and off-leash dogs have negative impacts on many segments of our citizenry. Leashed and off-leash dogs can interfere with the ability of visitors to appreciate the GGNRA or even result in some visitors avoiding parts of the GGNRA thus reducing the ability of the GGNRA to provide for "the enjoyment of future generations?"

Concern ID: 29859

CONCERN STATEMENT: Some visitors felt that walking their dog on-leash was inhumane. Dogs need to be able to run, and this is best achieved by off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 931 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191403 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a huge proponent of off-leash areas for dogs. Dogs provide tremendous service to many people and families, and to relegate them to on-leash walks at human pace, with little opportunity for native interaction with nature and with themselves is not adequate and not fair.

Corr. ID: 1986 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193165 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs need to run as well as we do leash makes this impossible. These proposals read leash, leash, leash leash. Very unfriendly.

Corr. ID: 2121 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193400 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Walking a dog on leash on the beach is inhumane! My dog would not understand this and would think he was being punished!

Concern ID: 29860

CONCERN Having a dog on-leash presents a greater hazard to cyclists than having dogs off-

STATEMENT: leash.**Representative Quote(s):****Corr. ID:** 395**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 181186**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Frankly, having my dog on a leash would be more dangerous to cyclists that speed by us if I'm on one side of the trail and she is on the other than if she is off leash. We try not to chose trails with a lot of bikes, especially on weekends.

GC7000 - General Comment: Support New Dog Management Plan**Concern ID:**

30527

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed Dog Management Plan benefits native wildlife and plant species by protecting areas within sensitive habitat from impacts of off-leash dog walking. The plan also provides important protection to threatened and endangered species. Restricting dog access to the park will allow for fewer dog interactions with wildlife and impacts from dogs on plants.

Representative Quote(s):**Corr. ID:** 300**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 181038**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I whole-heartedly support restricting dogs in our federal parks.

Our parks and beaches have become over-run with off-leash dogs who's owners ignore signs warning of sensitive habitat. I support protecting wildlife, wild birds and native plants.

Corr. ID: 447**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 181702**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am both a dog owner and a member of the Audobon society. I completely support protecting vital bird habitat. There is only one Pacific flyway and we need to protect this vital habitat for migrating birds. It makes no sense to allow a species to disappear just to give our dogs places to run.

Corr. ID: 1084**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 192219**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support protecting wildlife by restricting off-leash dogs. I am a native San Franciscan and I an inspired by seeing wildlife thriving in nature. To my dismay, even areas with signs requiring dogs to be on-leash, have been over-run by off-leash dogs. I have seen wildlife chased by dogs. The areas where I can go birdwatching have become so limited, I have resigned myself to hour plus drives to go to remote areas where no dogs are allowed. I applaud your efforts to create a sanctuary for wild animals in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 1754**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 191486**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Taken as a whole, the Preferred Alternative is the best of the plans offered. It balances the interests of the general public with those of dogs and their owners in a fair manner. It protects highly sensitive wildlife areas such as the nesting places of snowy plover and bank swallow, while providing ROLAs where dogs can run free within sight and voice range of their human companions. For example, it recognizes the importance of the recently restored area of Crissy Field, and at the same time provides a ROLA in part of the old airfield. It is a workable compromise.

Corr. ID: 2049**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 200540**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As much of a dog lover as I am, I strongly believe that our

domestic companion animals should never trample on the habitat of wildlife, particularly endangered and threatened wildlife. There are many other places in the area where we can walk our dogs off-leash. I strongly support the preferred alternative and the restriction of off-leash areas in the GGNRA. Thank you for your service

Corr. ID: 3022

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200995

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support these rules wholeheartedly. They still allow dogs to share our parks, but do so in a responsible way. I have been a volunteer in the Park since 1993, and have seen the damage that a small number of uncontrolled dogs can cause - along with the impact of the high numbers of dogs, even when they're under control. It's frustrating to see habitat restoration work destroyed by dogs digging and romping; as a bird lover, it's painful to watch dogs chase birds who are trying to rest or feed; it's annoying to encounter ill-behaved dogs who jump on people, tussle with other dogs and steal food from picnickers while their inattentive owners ignore the situation.

Concern ID:

30528

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters supported the plan as it would improve visitor experience for those park users who do not enjoy the presence of dogs. Visitors who were afraid of dogs would have more opportunities to have a no-dog experience in the GGNRA. Some visitors who enjoy dogs felt that their experience would be improved by having more controls on dogs, particularly off-leash dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1053

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192149

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a ten-year-old boy who has practically grown up in the Golden Gate National Parks. I was born just a few blocks from the Presidio, I go to school just outside of the Presidio, and my mom takes me to the parks all the time. My favorite places are Crissy Field, Lands End, and Rodeo Beach. I volunteer at Lands End, go to the Crissy Field Center summer camp, and regularly see movies at the Disney Museum.

I have been raised with dogs, and I love dogs. I think the dog plan that the National Park Service has proposed is very reasonable, because I don't think that dogs should have exclusive rights in the parks. Really, I don't think that dog WALKERS AND OWNERS should have exclusive rights in the parks. Why should they have priority over kids and babies and snowy plovers and lizardtail and monkeyflower? We all have to live together and in harmony, and the dog owners should not be the boss of everyone else.

I really love the parks, and I want them and their plants and animals and habitats to be around for everyone to enjoy.

Corr. ID: 1856

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200314

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have had many conflicts (on the brink of violence) with many many dog walkers in San Francisco (marina green, ocean beach, fort point) and in the marin headlands. I have stayed away from some very attractive areas of San Francisco due to overly aggressive dog owners (lands end, fort funston, lake merced, the presidio). I feel that the preferred alternative is a reasonable compromise but anything that allows for more off leash dog areas than proposed in the preferred alternative would not be acceptable to me.

Corr. ID: 3140

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202633

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I SUPPORT YOUR EFFORTS TO BETTER MANAGE DOGS IN THE PARKS!

As a San Franciscan with a small child, I am tired of vying for open space with rough, unleashed, unruly dogs. I am tired of dog poop everywhere.

There are way too many irresponsible dog owners, and they have a negative impact on our parks.

In the last few weeks, I have noticed dog poop all over Ocean Beach (at Lawton).

In April I watched an off-leash dog, at least a hundred yards from its owner, pee on another beach goer's bike and teeshirt!! And on Mothers Day in Golden Gate Park an unleashed dog ran over our picnic blanket.

My 3 year old is scared of dogs. Can you blame her?

Concern ID:

30529

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The preferred alternative strikes a fair compromise between dog owners and other user groups in the GGNRA. The plan provides adequate areas for all park uses and retains ample areas for dog walking both on and off-leash, while allowing areas for a no-dog experience. The plan also provides important protection of park resources.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 281

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180942

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a dog-owner, I feel the recommendations set forth in this proposal are an adequate compromise for all visitors to the GGNRA. I was left with the impression that dogs were banned in as few areas as possible, while maximized dog access through on-leash requirements. I believe on-leash regulations are in the best interest of all park visitors - it allows for dog-owners to enjoy their pet companions in our public lands while respecting non dog-owners and protecting the dogs themselves.

Corr. ID: 337

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181105

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have reviewed the maps and comments for preferred alternatives for all of the San Francisco GGNRA units. I believe that the preferred alternatives represent an equitable balance between those who prefer to bring dogs and those who don't. They also fulfill the mandate of the NPS to protect and preserve our wildlife and natural resources. I also believe that the preferred alternatives are realistic considering the limited amount of resources that can be used to enforce the adopted policy.

Corr. ID: 789

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186013

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I applaud the Park Service's work in constructing this plan and feel that it is a balanced approach that will allow citizens with dogs reasonable access while protecting park resources as well as citizens who don't want their park experience to be impacted by dogs.

Corr. ID: 2074

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200501

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the dog plan. I have nothing against dogs, and I feel that they should have the opportunity to get unfettered exercise, but not at the expense of the rest of the world. At Crissy Field, even leashed dogs can be a major nuisance, or rather their owners can, when the owner walks down one side the walkway and his or her leashed pet prowls the other side.

Corr. ID: 2189

Organization: Sierra Club and Save the Bay

Comment ID: 200584

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is vital to preserve and protect sensitive natural resources, particularly endangered bird species like the Snowy Plover and other

animals. The proposed NPS plan for limiting dog walking within GGNRA should be adopted without change.

This plan offers a good balance of access to dog owners while protecting wildlife and the quality of park experience. I am disappointed that many dog owners opposed to the plan cannot recognize the importance of protecting all animals in the park.

Corr. ID: 2504 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200720 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The park's mission is to protect the natural and cultural resources, not allow recreation to undermine it.

The park should better accommodate diverse park user groups, such as runners, horseback riders, families, and those with service animals, by offering more than one trail and more beach areas free from dog recreation.

All off-leash areas should be enclosed to protect park users, wildlife, and other natural areas. Also off-leash areas should be located and limited in scope to not have negative impact on sensitive wildlife habitats.

Thank you creating a better park experience at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and for giving imperiled species a chance to survive.

Concern ID:

30530

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The restrictions placed on dogs under the proposed plan will improve health and safety conditions for visitors in the park. The control of off-leash dogs will help reduce dog-related incidents.

For additional representative quotes, please see [Concern 29742 \(HS4010\)](#), [Comment 200496](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 20 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181450 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The plan makes a great deal of sense and moves toward protecting both the wildlife and human safety in open park spaces. Please implement these stricter rules and regulations for the benefit of the vast majority who simply wish to enjoy the beauty of the Bay Area in peace and safety.

Corr. ID: 430 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181617 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Kudos for this plan to restrict off-leash dog use at many GGNRA beaches. As a mother of a 2-year old who has been chased, barked at and snarled at by dogs on local trails and beaches, I firmly believe dogs are dangerous animals that need to be kept under control -- and "voice control" means nothing when the owner is not even in sight or paying no attention.

Corr. ID: 501 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181875 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the general direction of the proposed policy change, because it would improve visitor safety and reduce user conflicts. The policy is also finely tailored, and responsive to the individual circumstances and priorities in dozens of specific locations across the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 2035 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200346 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully support the proposed restrictions on off leash dogs in the GGNRA.

I have 2 small children and I feel like I can't use the Chrissy field beach due to off leash and aggressive dogs. Dogs often bark and target small children--making the beach unusable. And, dog themselves get into brawls off leash and it is dangerous for nearby children and people.

I currently live near a SF park with a fenced in dog area--this is the only way that this park is usable for people with small kids. Without a fenced in off leash dog area--most other parks in SF are unusable because people take their dogs off leash - -whether it is permitted or not.

Corr. ID: 3124 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201547 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am in favor of the Dog management plan. In the last few days, I have seen dogs being washed in the shower, dogs brought into the bathroom, dogs off leash in the pick nick area and parking lot, dog poop on the lawn and beach, a pit bull style dog fighting with some big fluffy dog both off leash that the owners were trying to pull apart at crissy east beach. Dogs growling at people on the beach.

Concern ID:

30531

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan has well-divided user spaces, so that all visitors to the park are accommodated. These areas are well thought out based on the environmental resources present at all the sites, and help mitigate impacts to these resources.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 835 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186142 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've looked over the Executive Summary, and it looks fairly balanced and well-thought-out. I like that there will be some off-leash areas, some on-leash areas, and some areas dogs, and I like that these decisions seem to be based on the relative environmental impact of dogs in different areas (such as the Crissy Field wildlife restoration area, and the Ocean Beach snowy plover protection area).

Corr. ID: 1633 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200216 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the preferred alternative. It balances the need to protect the park's resources, as required by law, and still provide more than adequate opportunity for dog owners to bring their dogs to the park. Please limit dog use and protect the park's precious natural resources for this and future generations of Americans. The GGNRA is public land - owned by all Americans, not a private dog run for San Francisco dog afficiandos.

Corr. ID: 3150 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202844 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I appreciate the work that has been done by GGNRA on the dog issue. I support the preferred alternatives (shaded areas in the plan). I believe the represent a balance between the needs of dog walkers and those that come to parks to enjoy a dog free experience.

I feel it is especially important to protect the beach areas. I have witnessed many instances where off-lease dogs chase down sea birds that are foraging in the surf.

Corr. ID: 4143 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208603 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my support for the preferred

alternative, with some basic adjustments. I base my support on the following:

- the preferred alternative makes the best attempt to maintain dog walking, and general public enjoyment, in the park while respecting natural and cultural resources
- the preferred alternative makes the best attempt to maintain dog walking in the park with consideration for the variety of public uses, particularly in heavily used areas
- the preferred alternative makes the best attempt at clarifying the need for dog management in a national park in an urban area that does not have a gate or clear boundaries

Concern ID:

30532

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters supported the preferred alternative because it will help place restrictions on commercial dog walkers. Many of these commenters felt that such restrictions would lessen many of the impacts on visitors and natural resources in the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4669

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209181

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Plan allows more access to dogs off leash than any other national park in the country. It puts reasonable restrictions on professional dog walkers who make a profit off public lands. It preserves our natural lands and protects wildlife. It protects visitors and park employees, some of whom have been bitten, charged or otherwise harassed by dogs off leash and, I might add, by their owners_ It also protects dogs by ensuring that everyone follows the same rules.

The GGNRA belongs to all citizens, not just those with dogs living in the San Francisco Bay Area. Everyone deserves a place where they can enjoy the quiet respite that a national park provides, especially in an urban area. No other national park allows unrestricted access to dogs off leash. Neither should the GGNRA.

Concern ID:

30533

CONCERN STATEMENT:

There are many other areas for off-leash dog walkers to enjoy in the Bay Area, and the plan provides ample space for off-leash dog walking. Off-leash areas should be limited in the GGNRA to provide more areas for other user groups, and to protect resources.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 908

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191282

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the NPS preferred alternative for the GGNRA Draft Dog management plan. As a Mill Valley resident and daily user of many of the designated trails and recreational areas, I have had an ongoing concern about the environmental / wildlife damage done by dogs. Even in areas currently designated as leash required, I encounter more off-leash dogs than on-leash dogs. I believe that the preferred plan provides sufficient dog resources on public lands.

Corr. ID: 1156

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192907

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We are dog lovers/owners ourselves, and we would never take our dog on a public beach unleashed.. We see absolutely nothing wrong with the GGNRA plan to require dogs to be on leashes on the beaches and in GGNRA. The fact that some areas will still allow off-leash dogs is, quite frankly, generous to dog owners.

Corr. ID: 4669

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209177 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is quite illuminating that almost all parks and trails in the municipalities surveyed allow dogs only on leash or in designated areas. The Plan allows dogs off leash in more areas than any national park, and more than in most local parks as well, including those in San Francisco.

Concern ID: 30534

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan provides clear and enforceable rules, which will make it more likely that visitors will comply with the regulations. In addition, the compliance-based management will also help to provide incentives for compliance with the new restrictions.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3059 **Organization:** Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Comment ID: 201238 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree that no new off leash dog areas be created inside the GGNRA. In my opinion, off leash dog recreation is a need that should be met by city and county parks.

I agree with the document that attempts to create easy to understand/ enforce areas for dog-focused recreation and other forms of recreation. This is the only way that the public can understand closures, as the seasonal closures at areas like Ocean Beach and Crissy Field have been so poorly complied with.

I agree with the compliance based management described in the plan. Allowing park users opportunities to improve their behavior before more restrictions are placed appears more than fair, and a 75% compliance level is a very generous level to expect.

Concern ID: 30535

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed dog management plan is beneficial for those users who would like to continue to ride horses in the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2177 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 200631 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I looked over the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement As a horseback rider, I was satisfied with the sections that included continued use of horseback riding in the GGNRA park system.

GC8000 - General Comment: Oppose New Dog Management Plan

Concern ID: 30628

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan punishes the majority of dog owners, who are respectful of GGNRA, follow the rules, and clean up after their dogs. It is not fair to implement such a policy, which targets those who are non-compliant by taking away the rights of the many who do comply with the rules. The Park Service should reject this plan, and instead work with dog groups and other users of the park to develop a plan that better meets the needs of users of the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 229 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 180728 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The vast majority of dog owners are respectful, law-abiding citizens who clean up after their pets and follow the rules. Please don't punish these people and their dogs by implementing a plan like this, which is directed at those who are disrespectful and irresponsible.

Corr. ID: 329 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 181093 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a resident of the city of San Francisco and a dog owner myself, I STRONGLY URGE you to work with the dog-advocate community to develop a more workable solution than the one that is currently being proposed.

Corr. ID: 1180 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193557 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: regulations should be implemented to penalize the violators, not the entire dog population. Most people who take the time to bring their dogs to an off-leash area love their animals and do their part to maintain the property and surroundings. Most dogs aren't a threat to the environment and other people so please reconsider the penalties and limitations these new regulations will bring.

Corr. ID: 1861 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200295 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: We recognize there are owners whom we would like to be more responsible with their dogs. But they are few in number - incidents involving dogs in GGNRA are less than 4% of all incidents in the park. Penalizing all dog owners for the behavior of a truly small minority is not the right approach.

Corr. ID: 2321 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195267 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Banning dogs or allowing on-leash dogs only in these wonderful parks punishes the majority of dogs and their owners because of the irresponsibility of a few owners. It would be like banning all cars because some drivers drive recklessly. Or banning all nightclubs because some people get drunk and violent. Fine the irresponsible people, not those who have well-behaved dogs and are doing nothing wrong.

Corr. ID: 3075 **Organization:** Nature Conservancy, American Society of Hospital Pharmacists

Comment ID: 201286 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: After reviewing the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS, I find the NPS alternatives too restrictive with respect to off-leash dog recreation, and are therefore unacceptable. As a member of the Nature Conservancy, park user, taxpayer and stakeholder, I strongly urge the NPS to work with the representatives of SFSPCA and Eco-Dog as equal partners in developing a management plan that is balanced, progressive, and forward thinking.

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

30629
The proposed dog management plan severely restricts the recreation of dog owners. These areas are necessary to maintaining the quality of life for dog owners in the bay area, as well as their health. If the plan is enacted, it will force dog owners to walk their dogs in situations that are more hazardous for dogs and owners.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 275 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180894 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: One of the best things about living in San Francisco is the unique opportunity dog owners have to enjoy the city's natural resources with their pets. Please don't take away off-leash dog walking privileges in the GGNRA. The quality of my life, and the lives of many Bay Area residents, will be greatly diminished if the proposed changes to the dog management plan are enacted.

Corr. ID: 1371 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195234 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The Draft Dog Management Plan would reduce our enjoyment and use of the park considerably. The more restrictive uses would

definitely change my activities with my dog as I would imagine it would for other dog owners. There is tremendous value to going to off leash areas, such as Ocean Beach, with my dog. I urge the city not to change the current dog management rules.

Corr. ID: 1880

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200607

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a dog owner who would be affected by the proposed policy, but I object not only because it will affect me, but because it will prevent people of all ages from enjoying beaches and trails with their dogs with no sound basis for doing so. The management plan provides no support for its conclusion that exclusion of users with dogs is the best solution to occasional user conflict. Moreover, the study specifically cites concerns about habitat, particularly birds, but cites no studies to support those concerns.

Concern ID:

30630

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan will negatively impact the health of many Bay Area residents, particularly those who are elderly or disabled, and walk regularly with their dogs. Restricting dog access will mean these visitors can no longer use the parks, or will not be able to get sufficient exercise for themselves or their dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1203

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194830

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Health of our Elders: Fort Funston and other off-leash areas in the Bay Area has become a haven for older people to walk their dogs, socialize with other seniors, and form a community that makes their lives more fulfilling. The vitality of this community will be greatly diminished if your proposal goes into effect. Their health and vitality is greatly increased as a result. If anything, off-leash dog walking ought to be encouraged, especially for seniors, as a way to lead more healthy and fulfilling lives.

Corr. ID: 3039

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201044

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a 33 year old mother, who lives on the beach in Northern California. For most of my life, I have had at least one family dog. They have been part of our family, joining us in almost every outing, from daily beach walks to annual camp outs. They have also been the inspiration to be active in nature, during times I may not have been normally. On days where I may have been lazy or too stressed out, instead, my dogs have urged me to get outdoors, to breathe some fresh air, to appreciate my outdoor surroundings. In our hectic lives, it is these times that help keep us grounded, relieve our daily stresses and therefore allow us to become better people.

During most of my walks, my dogs have been off leash and under my voice control. They have been able to run freely and play, jump in the water, and meet other dogs. It is one of the most enjoyable parts of my day.

Closing or limiting the ability to bring dogs on trails, parks, and beaches is a heartbreaking thought.

It means you are denying an important ritual, and depressing the psyche for many people. It means more stress, caused by not having the ability to walk easily and accessibly. It means declining health both mentally and physically by not getting daily exercise outdoors.

It means less active people outdoors-those who care for our environment because we appreciate it on a daily basis.

I urge you to allow access for dogs and their owners on our beaches, trails and

parks for the general health and sanity of our communities. It is crucial to our well being .We all need to be able to enjoy the outdoors with our best companions.

Corr. ID: 3877 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205771 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I write to oppose the current GGRN dog-management plan. Current off-leash parks have long histories of serving the residents of San Francisco, and their canine companions, well, without undue restraints on non-dog-accompanied residents. To reduce the off-leash area is to create harm to the health and mental health of all residents of this beautiful city. My dog died in August 2010, but I continue to go to Crissy Field and Fort Funston for my walks, especially because I want to be able to see and greet the many beautiful dogs being given the fresh air and exercise they need.

Corr. ID: 4012 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206324 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan and protest it's unfair impact on single senior women who hike with their dogs for health. With a history of heart disease in my family, my physician has recommended hiking for exercise for physical and emotional health. I hike with my dog for safety. It is not realistic to think that I can do a vigorous hike on the slopes with my dog on a six foot leash.

Corr. ID: 4231 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208569 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. The GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation. It was designed as an urban recreation area, and one of the biggest recreation needs in an urban area is dog-walking. Dogs such as my Irish Setter, and many other large breed dogs, cannot get enough exercise on leash; they need to be able to run. The draft 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.

Concern ID: 30631

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters were opposed to the proposed restrictions, and felt that it was unnecessary to have rules that differed from the rules of the city and county where the parks are located. The proposed plan would be difficult and costly to enforce, and sets users up to be in non-compliance. If enforcement does not occur, this plan will not result in any changes.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 335 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181103 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: while I am a law abiding citizen - I vote, pay taxes, am fairly active - I seem to be completely out of step with your current plans. I guess I'm ultimately unclear why the Federal government can create pet rules that are different than the cities or counties where these parks are housed.

Corr. ID: 1501 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191356 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: That false premise is that in a place like GGNRA you can resolve differences between competing users by drawing lines on maps and imposing rules on those maps that say you can do this here but not there, you can do the other thing there but not here, except in the following cases, and you can't do any of it in this place and all of it in that place. It won't work. It is horrifically complicated, too hard for the average park user to understand. It will encourage

them to violate the rules when no one is looking and you can't possibly police this yourselves. The aggrieved parties at this site or the other will continue fighting to amend the rules and the lines -- forever -- so its a prescription for unending resentment and conflict.

Corr. ID: 2042

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200536

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm still not happy with the options you've created for dog-owning families in the city. They're not realistic, you don't have the staff available to enforce them, and they just won't work for our city.

Corr. ID: 2964

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203636

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to voice my opposition to the preferred alternative, and my support for a no-change policy or a new alternative, which would allow dogs everywhere that is currently off-leash, plus create sufficient off-leash opportunities in San Mateo County.

Additionally, a new alternative should remove the compliance-based management strategy. I believe the preferred alternative would substantially change my quality of life, as well as that of my dog, by removing social and exercise outlets.

I believe that the preferred alternative violates the mandate for the " maintenance of needed recreational open space" contained in the legislation that created the GGNRA.

There are not enough trails with off-leash access in the Preferred Alternative. The contraction of areas available for off-leash recreation will significantly compromise the park experience for people with dogs, and contribute to crowding and traffic problems, especially in San Francisco's parks, as more and more people are forced into smaller and smaller areas.

A new alternative should target enforcement on the small number of people whose dogs misbehave, rather than excluding the entire class of people with dogs from most of the GGNRA.

Finally, the level of enforcement required by the Preferred Alternative is excessive and unsustainable. Targeting people walking their dogs irresponsibly and leaving responsible dog walkers alone would be a much more efficient use of GGNRA resources. The DEIS states that it will cost nearly \$1million to enforce the Preferred Alternative, through the hiring of more Park Rangers or Park Police. In an era of shrinking federal budgets, this seems a poor use of scarce financial resources. Existing Park Rangers could more easily enforce already existing rules such as picking up pet litter or no chasing of birds. These enforcement actions are all that are needed to ensure responsible dog walking and minimal impact on natural resources and other park visitors from off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 3788

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205323

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think the Dog Management Plan is too ambitious in terms of micro management. It's application and enforcement could lead a lot of cost and ill will from the public. I am not convinced that it is necessary. Hence, I believe Alternative A is best if the Plan has too be imposed

Concern ID:

30632

CONCERN

[Dog owners already have so little access to areas in the GGNRA with their dogs, to](#)

STATEMENT:

restrict this further as is proposed in the DEIS is unfair to dog owners. These areas need to be available for dog walkers, for their safety, and visitor experience. Having these areas will not impact other NPS properties.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 370 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181153 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a responsible tax payer, registered voter and registered dog owner, I am appalled by this proposed plan. Currently only 1% of all the National Golden Gate Recreational Area allows dog access and now to propose limiting that by 90% is an outrageous.

Corr. ID: 808 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186050 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA's Dog Management Plan is wrong, and should be defeated. A tiny percentage of land of the GGNRA is available for off-leash dog walking, and off-leash dogs do not affect in any meaningful way the management of other areas in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 1374 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195241 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: An on leash dog provides little to no more risk to the habitat than the person using the trail but provides a huge measure of security and safety to a women hiking on such a trail by herself. I am already unable to take advantage of many of the beautiful trails in the Bay Area for this reason and proposing further inhibitions of this type are extremely disappointing. In fact, I would not support any politician who proposed or supported such changes. I would avidly support laws enforcing existing rules such as heavy fines and enforcement of waste pick-up or ensuring dogs are on leash, but consider laws prohibiting leashed dogs on a trail both a safety issue for myself and not justifiable.

Corr. ID: 2993 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203704 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing as a voter, taxpayer, and responsible dog owner to oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan. It goes too far in banning and restricting dogs. Walking and hiking with my dogs is one of my main forms of recreation. It's good for my physical and emotional health. Most of the California state parks and the federal parks are not dog friendly, which makes it more essential that the few places where dogs are allowed be maintained. I think the draft management plan greatly exaggerates the issues related to dogs in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3067 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201253 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm writing to oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan that reduces opportunities to enjoy hiking in open spaces with my good dog companion Luke. Having my dog accompany me on the Coastal Trail makes me feel safe and secure when we encounter homeless denizens of the Trail, take a twilight stroll, or visit the trail during inclement weather and few other people. There would be no reason to go on the Trail if he had to be left at home. I don't want to see my tax dollars go towards limiting options to physical exercise and healthier choices, because it's far better to get outside and play rather than sit at home and mope. That's exactly what we would do, Luke and I, since we don't have a car and cannot drive to a park far away that permits a dog to run and frolic with other dogs. Please keep the Coastal Trail a place where I can go with my dog and get away from the stress of the city.

Corr. ID: 3990 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207399 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to strongly oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. While I understand and support your conservation efforts, I believe this current plan does not adequately reflect the importance of off-leash dog walking areas in, or near, San Francisco.

While I do believe the current plan relies on some questionable studies to draw certain (questionable) conclusions, I am not a scientist, and therefore cannot speak directly to these points. Instead, I simply want to voice my concern that this plan does not adequately consider the negative impacts on all Bay Area residents.

For the past 8 years we have taken our dog to Fort Funston twice a week. This is a necessary and important routine in our lives to maintain the health of our dog, and ourselves. Fort Funston, and other parks mentioned in your plan, provide essential off-leash areas in a way that a standard dog park cannot. While San Francisco does provide (limited) off-leash dog parks, the bulk of them are far too small to be of any real value for medium to large dogs.

The GGNRA land is an integral part of Bay Area life. It provides the only truly open space within reasonable distance. The current policies in place already severely limit dog access to GGNRA land, and these proposed restrictions will unfairly reduce that access even further - leaving many dog lovers with no viable options.

Corr. ID: 4274

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209089

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a resident of San Francisco, CA, I am writing you to express my earnest concern regarding the Draft Dog Management Plan released by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area ("GGNRA") on January 11, 2011.

Currently, 1% of the GGNRA-controlled land allows for dogs to be off leash and under voice control. If the proposed plan is passed, it will effectively eliminate the off-leash areas of over 90% of that 1% and will significantly change usage and enjoyment of this recreational area for the thousands of dogs and dog owners in the city. If passed, it will also have an extremely negative impact on the population/usage of existing city parks and neighborhoods, which would be forced to absorb the overflow from GGNRA-controlled land.

Concern ID:

30633

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Many commenters were opposed to the proposed plan because of the impacts it would have on city and county parks. These impacts would result in dangerous and unhealthy situations, and some dogs do not do well in these kind of parks.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 399

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181191

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are over 100,000 dogs in San Francisco and they need somewhere to go. Fort Funston and the Presidio are wonderful places for dogs to run off leash. This is one reason San Francisco is beautiful and unique. By restricting off-leash walking in the GGNRA this will destroy our neighborhood parks. There are just too many dogs and not enough parks already.

Corr. ID: 1583

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190807

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The negative impact on the city parks will be enormous if off-leash dog walking is prohibited at GGNRA areas = where will all those dogs go? Stern Grove, Dubore Park, Golden Gate Park, etc. Those facilities cannot handle greater dog traffic. For this reason alone this policy should not be adopted.

Corr. ID: 2796

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201143

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We are writing to oppose the proposed Dog Management Plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We are long-time residents of San Francisco. We have been responsibly walking our dogs at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands and other locations in the GGNRA for many years. Our current dog has recently earned his Canine Good Citizen certification from the AKC. Our dog are always either on-lead or under voice control.

We are long-time environmentalists and strongly support laws and regulations that protect the environment, but not this one.

Daily walks with our family, friends and our dogs in the GGNRA is an important part of our social life. It also plays a major role in our exercise program for keeping healthy.

Wildlife in the GGNRA needs protection but the proposed GGNRA plan is too extreme. The San Francisco Bay Area is a heavily populated urban area where multiple needs have to be balanced. The proposed GGNRA plan does not sufficiently protect the needs of people compared to the needs of a relatively small number of birds.

In addition, prohibiting dogs in the GGNRA will force dog owners to use other dog parks in the city causing overcrowding in the dog parks and parking problems in surrounding neighborhoods.

We respectfully urge you to actively oppose this extreme and counterproductive proposal.

Corr. ID: 3186

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203837

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs that are not adequately exercised can develop behavioral problems such as barking, destroying property in the home, etc. This obviously creates a ripple effect, extending into the neighborhoods and communities throughout our fine city. If the few existing off leash areas were further prohibited as proposed by the GGNRA, the result would be devastating for all. All of the parks in San Francisco that are not part of GGNRA land, will be overrun by dogs. The DEIS does not adequately address dispersion issues. The DEIS 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. Even more importantly, the DEIS 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. 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 DEIS suggests people with dogs go. This exemplifies the lack of

common sense and awareness present in these overly restrictive plans. For the sake of all San Franciscans, a better alternative must be reached.

Corr. ID: 3519 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201262 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to ask you to stop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area from implementing its dog management plan.

My friends come from Castro Valley, Redwood City, San Bruno just to walk their dogs. It is such a sense of community walking Mori Point and at times it's my meditation after a hards day work. Working with dogs, there are more dogs than you may realize that do not do well in dog parks. My dog has been bullied in dog parks and hence will not go in them without hiding under a park bench. She is wonderful off leash running free and it's a true pleasure to watch.

Dogs without proper exercise can end up with behavioral problems which may mean dropping a dog off at the shelter. I also volunteer at the Peninsula Humane Society and they surely don't need more dogs in their shelter. People also need daily exercise, and some people wouldn't even be out walking if it wasn't for their dogs. As you know there are health benefits from daily exercise, such as weight loss, controlling blood sugar and cholesterol, as well as mental benefits.

Corr. ID: 3600 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203733 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Owning a dog implies a commitment to treating the animal well. That entails giving the dog sufficient exercise. If GGNRA enacts its current proposal, I will have no where to take my dog for exercise. Those areas that will be left, will be overrun by the 100,000+ dogs that reside in this city.

I need the protection of my dog and my dog needs to be treated well and get the exercise she needs. Without that, I run the risk of my dog changing her nature and becoming more aggressive and less reliable which puts me at risk.

GGNRA has not substantiated that there is actual damage from dogs. It has implied that there might be. Before we eliminatae dogs from these areas we need to be assured that there is actual damage that can not be avoided by some other means.

Corr. ID: 3688 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204214 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA is a multi use facility and it is my observation that the current rules are fair to all. Severely curtailing permitted current uses will only place added burdens on our already over-burdened City park facilities.

I respectfully urge that you continue the current multi-use regulations which have proven to be fair to the overwhelming numbers of users of Park facilities. To do otherwise is to unfairly penalize pet owners and the desires of our elected officials.

Concern ID:

30638

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The original intent for creation of the GGNRA was a park to serve an urban area. Recreational uses included off-leash dog walking, and to remove this use under the proposed plan goes against the mandate for the GGNRA. Off-leash dog walking is part of the history and culture of the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 40 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181770 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Walking your dog off leash long predates GGNR. It is part of GGNR's history and culture and therefore it deserves to be preserved. This plan does not do that. It appears deliberately designed to limit access or provide access only where it is difficult or impractical to use.

Corr. ID: 754

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 185436

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: the Preferred Alternative severely restricts recreational access for people with dogs, a fundamental violation of the reason the GGNRA was created. In the legislation that created it, the reason for the creation of the GGNRA is listed as "the maintenance of needed recreational open space." Off-leash dog walking is among the recreational activities listed as traditionally occurring in the land that was to become the GGNRA. There is no off-leash access in San Mateo County in the Preferred Alternative and that must be changed.

Corr. ID: 3130

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202033

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: the legislation that created the GGNRA, the reason for the creation of the GGNRA is listed as "the maintenance of needed recreational open space." Off-leash dog walking is among the recreational activities listed as traditionally occurring in the land that was to become the GGNRA. When dogs are walked in a responsible way (as most are), there is no conflict with the environment or with other park users. Target people not walking their dogs responsibly, but leave the vast majority of us alone.

The 1979 Pet Policy allowed dogs off-leash on less than 1% of GGNRA land. In other words, 99% of all GGNRA land is off-limits to dogs now. There is much-most-GGNRA land where humans will see either no dogs or dogs only on-leash. On the Oakwood Valley trails, for example, I frequently count the ratio of people with and without dogs and it is usually about 12-15 people using the trails with a dog and even at popular times of the day (Saturday morning, for instance), 1 or 2 people walking without dogs.

All evidence points to the status quo as being the best of the options presented in the new proposal. It's the policy in effect since 1979, and over 99% of people and dogs seem to co-exist under current policy with no trouble. I would support some reasonable changes-perhaps new restrictions, such as licenses for dog walking in the GGNRA, and/or fees, for "commercial" dog walkers, which even the dog walkers' associations supports.

Corr. ID: 3581

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203641

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I have attended a number of public meetings on the subject and have studied the findings in the report. As a San Franciscan who has been involved in the area of park advocacy, I am very distressed to think that we are about to remove most of the off-leash areas in the GGNRA. I served on a citizen's advisory committee in the mid-1970's when the GGNRA was just in its infancy. The idea to create an "urban park" by replacing outdated military sites with all types of recreational needs was so exciting. This was to be a unique park. It was not a pristine wilderness but rather the reclamation of restricted and areas that had been off-limits to our citizens. Dog recreation was encouraged as a way to bring people out to the new park lands. It worked and in fact worked well for over 40 years. Which is why this is so distressing. The proposed rules will seriously impact thousands of our citizens.

Corr. ID: 3715

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202261 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Having read the proposed plan at great length and attended several of the NPS Open Houses I write to oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan. I find the NPS is once again skewing evidence and scientific fact to mislead, exaggerate, speculate and manipulate and forming conclusions that are neither based in fact nor supported by science or the law.

The GGNRA is large enough, at more than 75,000 acres, to accommodate both recreation and conservation. Originally designed as an urban recreation area and not as a pristine wilderness area, like Yosemite and many other National Parks, NPS now seeks to alter the mandate of its creation. It is worth noting that the courts have repeatedly upheld the existing 1979 pet policy. They have said that it was consistent in both fact and intent with the original mandate for recreation upon which the GGNRA was founded. The area now in contention, upon which the NPS wishes to leash dogs, is in fact less than 1% of the total acreage of the park.

This plan would disenfranchise an entire class of park visitor in favor of other classes. It disregards the health and well being of people, dogs, and the community and arbitrarily excludes Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions, discriminating against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others. Moreover the NPS is blatantly disregarding their avowed purpose to "provide a variety of visitor experiences" by ignoring the obvious needs of a large part of the visitor constituent - those who are dog owners. They are being singled out and excluded in favor of hikers, walkers, mountain bicyclists, equestrians, bird watchers, fishermen, naturists and beachgoers.

Corr. ID: 4072 **Organization:** Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP

Comment ID: 207761 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Adopting severe restrictions limiting access based on the will of a few individuals is directly contrary to the goals of the GGNRA, which was created for all people to enjoy. In the open spirit with which the GGNRA was created and to avoid the costly, time consuming dispute that will undoubtedly ensue should the GGNRA adopt the Preferred Alternative, the GGNRA should reject the Preferred Alternative and uphold its commitment to ensuring open recreational access to land designated as such by Congress.

Concern ID:

30639

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Allowing dogs to run off-leash is inconsistent with the NPS goals of conservation. Off-leash dogs also provide a hazard to the public, and restrict users of the park. Compliance is already an issue, and the proposed plan does not go far enough to protect other park users.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 626 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181300 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a long-time user of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and a dog owner, would like to express my strong concerns about the proposal to allow dogs to roam leash- free. The preferred alternative, as written, allows national park land to be used for an intensive recreational use that is inconsistent with conservation and would result in public safety hazards and limitations on the broad community's enjoyment of the public parks, as well as limiting equal access for disabled communities and communities of color.

Corr. ID: 2313 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195289 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I wholeheartedly support Michael Lynes, conversation

director for the Golden Gate Audobon Society when he says that the proposed rules don't go far enough. AND I sincerely hope that the NPS doesn't give in to the all too powerful dog lobby of San Francisco. Quite frankly I think the recent SF Board of Supervisors decision is very misguided.

Hold your ground and protect our wildlife, environment and public spaces.
(Note: public NOT animal/dog spaces)

Corr. ID: 3768 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204821 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a frequent visitor to GGNRA lands of San Francisco and San Mateo County for more than 20 years, I have noted that the majority of dog walkers do not follow the leash or voice control requirements. The proposed new dog management policy is too weak to protect natural resources/wildlife (plants and animals), people who have a fear of dogs, and other dogs who are on leash.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

30640

Off-leash dogs interact with each other and park users better than dogs that are on-leash. The plan restricts the areas for off-leash walking, which should be left the way they are. Reducing these areas will adversely affect some users of the park, who rely on off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3764 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204810 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA management plan for off-leash dogs. I have two small dogs, 20 lbs. each and as a city dweller, a fourth generation San Franciscan living in Cow Hollow, the accessibility to Crissy Field has been exceptional as a place I have gone almost every weekend for the past six years. Words can't describe how important this area is for dogs to play, run and socialize - we've been so lucky to have it. If you take it away, or limit our access, it would be a crime. Dogs need socialization - they're much better adjusted, interact better with other dogs and humans

Corr. ID: 4329 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208869 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: am writing to urge you not to implement the proposed changes to the off-leash areas in the GGNRA. I have lived in San Francisco for fifteen years and have a family including a young child and a three-year-old puppy. We especially love hiking as a family with our dog on Montara Mountain (where we usually only run into a few other people or dogs), as well as Ft. Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Muir Beach. We enjoy seeing people of all ages, races, family units, and well-socialized dogs out at these beautiful places. I believe that part of the wonderful charm of San Francisco is the openness and tolerance of the people, which is reflected in how beautifully the dogs play when out in these open park spaces. In over a decade of using these spaces heavily with and without a dog I have not encountered any dog fights in any of them. (The only violence at all that I can think of is hearing on the news that someone was stabbed in the Ft. Funston parking lot, by another person, of course, who was not a dog owner.)

This plan, if implemented, will make the Bay Area less healthy and more dangerous for both people and dogs. Everyone who works with dogs is well familiar with the fact that a dog who is allowed to run and play in open spaces and play and socialize with other dogs is less neurotic and much better behaved than dogs who are left at home or tied up in the yard--those dogs are the ones who become aggressive and hard to control. An excellent example of this is the great

behavior of all the dogs who showed up at the protest march on Mar. 21.

Concern ID:

30643

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having the park as entirely dog free or no dogs on the beaches and/or trails is unfair. The impacts of banning dogs from the parks need to be studied in more detail before such a plan is enacted. This will negatively impact the experience of many park users.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 551

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182021

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I don't support this proposal at all. While I think it is fine to make certain designated areas a dog free zone, moving to uniform dog free is too much. For example, the eastern part the beach on Chrissy field could be made dog free, while the western part would be a place where dogs are allowed to play.

Corr. ID: 794

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186023

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm a bit stunned that you all are considering the total ban of dogs on our beaches.

Corr. ID: 838

Organization: Resident

Comment ID: 186151

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It was absolutely devastating to hear the news that our rights to enjoy the hundreds of trails in our community with our dog could be banned.

Please consider our plea to stop the ban to allow dogs on GGNRA parks and trails

Corr. ID: 877

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190042

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have never seen any damage to the land or other creatures. These proposed ordinances make no sense- don't seem to add any protection to the area and feel very punitive to us dog owners and nature lovers who use and love these spaces. I have not seen or heard any sensible rationale for the proposed changes. All the dog owners we know are very supportive and careful about their use of the land.

We strongly urge to reconsider the ordinances.

Corr. ID: 917

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191331

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With all due respect, this appears to be sloppy policy.

The completeness of this plan deserves scrutiny. The purposes, rationale provided are subjective and the plan does not present a balanced analysis of current and future state policies and enforcement.

If this plan were to be implemented, it would have to be considered poor practice until all the economic, social, environmental, cultural, biological, oceanic and residential impacts have been quantifiably measured and accurately assessed.

With a large percentage of the NPS land already off limits to canines, it is puzzlingly how noticable benefits will be realized by making 100% of NPS land off limits to canines. What is the return on investment of the cost of enforcement, monitoring and process? I assume tax payers will foot the bill for that cost?

As with all plans, there are "winners" and there are "losers". It would appear that, should this plan be implemented, the loser will be the NPS for pushing through an

incomplete plan and most likely an incremental, unnecessary cost burden to tax payers.

Corr. ID: 1309 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195051 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Instead of banning dogs, why don't you enforce laws such as dog licenses fees, vaccination proof and require that vicious dogs wear muzzles? San Francisco is a city full of young residents who have dogs, do you want them to leave the city because there is no place for their dogs?

Corr. ID: 1814 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191803 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think that removing dogs from GGNRA parks and trails would be an absolutely ridiculous and unfair policy. Banning dogs from these trails would force an unnecessary amount of people to have to change where they walk their dogs. This proposition is extremely unfair and allows horses to still use these trails. Horses are just as bad for the trails as dogs if not worse. Banning dogs from the trails does not make sense and will be extremely unfair to many dog walkers, and their dogs.

Corr. ID: 1963 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200492 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It would be heartbreaking for dogs and dog owners if dogs were prohibited from Bay Area beaches. Especially in an urban area such as San Francisco, where there aren't many places where dogs can run and mingle, it seems critically important that dogs be allowed on the beaches. In Sonoma County, many of the state- and county-run beaches allow dogs, and it seems to be working out just fine. Please reconsider making this policy changes, and instead continue to allow dogs on the beach.

Corr. ID: 2343 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195385 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep the GGNRA open to off-leash dogs!! As a 12-year resident of San Francisco, I can honestly say that going to Fort Funston and Crissy Field with my dog is one of my favorite things to do here in my city. It's safe to say that they are also my dog's favorite places too! This issue is not just about dogs, but about the quality of life for the pet owners that get so much enjoyment out of visiting the GGNRA. Please consider alternatives to banning off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 2887 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202932 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a life-long San Franciscan, who has extensively walked/run/surfed/pic-nicked at Fort Funston, I strongly oppose the current proposal. The problems associated with dogs off leash are greatly exaggerated. Please don't ruin the enjoyment of using the beach as a place to run and play with a dog when the actual problems associated with dogs off leash can be handled in a less intrusive case-by-case manner. A blanket policy to require leashing pets on a huge open public beach is a bad policy.

Corr. ID: 3032 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201033 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am completely floored over the attempt to ban dogs from being off leash. I do understand the need to preserve wilderness, and I myself am an advocate for protecting land and animals. However, there must be balance, as with everything in life. If this land is taken from the dogs, they will have nowhere safe to play in the city. The land has been being shared with dogs, humans, plants and animals for the last 1,000 years. I do not want this plan to pass.

Corr. ID: 4561 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209906 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to strongly protest the efforts of the GGNRA in restricting dogs from running off a leash on GGNRA lands. First I would like to establish why the GGNRA was created: Congress created the GGNRA in 1972 to: "to provide public access along the waterfront and to expand the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region." The proposed dog ban appears to be in direct opposition to that mandate.

Concern ID:

30644

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There is no evidence to support implementing the proposed plan. The justifications presented are largely anecdotal, and are not based on hard evidence. Many of the statistics given do not indicate a change is needed. Additionally, some necessary areas of impacts, such as the impact on the urban environment, was not studied.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 587

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182124 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly oppose the proposed plan. The recommended action would severely restrict the ability of responsible dog owners (and their pets) to use and enjoy what are already very limited recreation areas. Yet, there doesn't seem to be any factual support for why the recommended option was chosen beyond anecdotal reasoning.

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192027 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS should have focused on real, material problems with dog walking such as use of leashes in busy areas; collection of pet waste; dealing with aggression by some dogs; discomfort with dogs on the part of some visitors; and any significant environmental issues. Importantly, to provide a basis for the assessment of dog walking in the context of other activities, the preparers of the DEIS should have obtained (but failed to do so) some good, solid data on the overall number of visitors to each site and the breakdown of visitors by activity, including dog walking, as well as by domicile (San Francisco, Bay Area, etc.) Instead, the DEIS relies on qualitative estimates on level of activity by visitors. Moreover, in each section of the report, rather than identifying and documenting real issues with dog walking, the preparers of the DEIS highlight trivial problems and risks, often with no context and no support for claims. As a result, the DEIS does not accurately characterize the effects of dog walking on visitors and the environment. Due to these weaknesses the DEIS lacks credibility, and the resultant "Draft Dog Plan" lacks any foundation.

Corr. ID: 2959

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203662 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think this proposal is shameful. I've reviewed the statistics and see the majority of citations are for leash infractions. The number of people who've been bitten by a dog are exceedingly FEW ... and while it's unfortunate that some people have dogs who are not controlled, it's not a reason to end this amazing era of dog friendly community we enjoy regularly.

Corr. ID: 3870

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205700 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan because it fails to include any site-specific documentation of existing conditions and their analysis thereof.

The document states in general the impacts caused by dogs without any reference to actual impacts already caused. As the GGNRA is made up of vast lands, specific

places as well as specific impacts must be documented to support the Plan's conclusion.

There is also a lack of information on the resource degradation, i.e. what these resources are. To justify the conclusion, the Draft Plan must be able to demonstrate how the degradation of these resources are specifically caused by dogs, as opposed to impacts caused by humans, other wildlife and predatory plants and species. In other words, I ask that the GGNRA look more specifically at each area, document the impacts of all park uses, disclose all information to the public and come up with a new alternative.

Corr. ID: 4630

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208645

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not agree with the GGNRA's current preferred alternatives as they significantly restrict and eliminate 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, the appropriate considerations for an urban recreation area or long-term monitoring of site-specific conditions.

Amazingly, there are major areas of impact that the DEIS is required to study that it did not. The law is clear that the DEIS must look at impacts to not only the natural environment, but also to the human environment (health and community), and the urban environment (the surrounding areas). These studies are conspicuously absent from the DEIS making it a grossly biased document and, by default, its recommendations of Preferred Alternatives are highly flawed.

Corr. ID: 4712

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209794

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The here and now (site specific data) -

A related problem with the draft EIS is that it does not address site specific conditions and resources.

The draft plan and draft EIS are in some respects about 20 plans and EISs, because they examined each GGNRA area.

The courts have consistently explained that difficulty does not excuse lack of adequate data and study in an EIS. And the bulk or size of an EIS does not equate to its adequacy.

- In many places, the draft EIS lack any description of actual site specific impacts on which closure decisions are being made. In other places, the draft EIS 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.

Concern ID:

30654

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan would place dog walkers and those groups that may not want to interact with dogs into the same areas, which would increase conflicts between user groups. Restricting off-leash dogs in the park would likely increase off-leash dog walking on city streets and in city parks, negatively impacting visitors who do not like dogs in these areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1016

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191779

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am vehemently against the proposed restrictions proposed in the draft dog management plan.

Ft Funston used to be occupied mainly by drug dealers and derelicts and today it is a vibrant area that many dogs and dog owners enjoy. The trails in the Presidio and

Lands end are also safer because of the increased visitation due to dog owners that want their dogs to get exercise. If the leash laws are implemented, most of these dog owners will just go to their neighborhood parks which will increase traffic in those small parks that are not equipped to handle more people and dogs, Currently, small neighborhood parks are generally used by families with small children and the larger parks are used by pet owners. That balance will be greatly disrupted if the leash laws are imposed.

Corr. ID: 1747

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191214

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: OPPOSE proposed plan

KEEP existing (1979) plan.

New plan is too restrictive - preventing use by the PEOPLE who use the parks the most.

It also forces more dogs into the area most accessible to the kind of people who want to avoid dogs (elderly, slow walkers, families with small children)

Concern ID:

30655

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters were against the proposed plan, because they did not think that dogs should be leashed at all times. Additionally, having dogs on-leash in these areas will create more safety problems.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1507

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191407

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Preferred Alternative severely restricts recreational access for people with dogs, a fundamental violation of the reason the GGNRA was created. In the legislation that created it, the reason for the creation of the GGNRA (NOT a national park!!) is listed as "the maintenance of needed recreational open space." Off-leash dog walking is among the recreational activities listed as

traditionally occurring in the land was to become the GGNRA.

In addition, the Preferred Alternative discourages cooperation between different park users and will increase conflict between park users, as more and more people are crammed into smaller and smaller spaces. Park user groups can work together to resolve problems when they come up.

Concern ID:

30656

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan will negatively impact the economy including those small businesses that rely on the parks, mainly dog walkers. Having off-leash areas condensed will increase the possibility of conflicts, and will mean dog walkers must not walk as many dogs, hurting income.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 971

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191652

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My issue with the plan is that I feel it doesn't include a balance between recreation, the environment and the small business in san francisco. I have 2 dogs and they have a dog walker 2x per week that takes them to the off leash area in fort funston. If the off leash area is restricted there will be more dogs in a smaller space and this will affect the dogs and the dog walkers business. More dogs in a smaller space could mean a greater chance or communicable diseases amongst the dogs, and possibly more dog injuries to dogs and the dog walkers alike. The existing off-leash dog areas may become too crowded which

could mean the dog walkers have to cut back on the dogs they accept resulting in a decreased income. Currently the justification for the plan is for environmental reasons, and while the environment is key, it's only part of the equation. I believe all parts of the equation must be better balanced so I opposed the off leash restrictions in the plan.

Corr. ID: 1102

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192283

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please don't let the ability for my dog to run free in these park areas be taken away. There is so little available space in SF for him to run free, I feel his life will be much less happy and healthy if this freedom is removed from his and our lives.

I would imagine this would also have an impact on the many dog walking businesses around the city, as we would probably not pay for the service if it did not include the 'running free' activity during the daily walk.

Corr. ID: 1840

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192113

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have recently become aware of the proposed legislation banning dogs from trails in the GGNRA. I cannot stress how ill advised this decision is. Dogs are an integral part of Marin County. From the Tennessee Valley-Muir Beach trail to Crissy field, dogs are a common sight. Quite frankly, if you ban them from the GGNRA, you will have a loss in profits. What dog owner wants to go for a walk to the Crissy Field warming hut or to any number of GGNRA sponsored vendors without their dog? And as to the fact that horses are still going to be allowed, I can't begin to explain why this is hypocritical. Horses tear up trails, eat vegetation and leave large piles of feces. If horses are allowed, dogs must also be allowed.

Corr. ID: 2153

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193453

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Conversely, visitors to Marin County enjoy our beautiful trails with their dogs. Marin County is known for its dog-friendly trails. Far fewer visitors will help our community thrive, if they can not bring their dogs when they vacation

Corr. ID: 2982

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203676

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I oppose the GGNRA dog management plan. I think it will result in an increase # of dogs in shelters and euthanized (a good dog is a tired dog), will increase unemployment (dog walkers are a new cottage industry) and will reduce the number of people of enjoy Fort Funston and Crissy Fields (I lived in the Bay Area for 15 years before enjoying GGNRA parks and it is my dog and favorite hiking companion who brought me to them).

Corr. ID: 3030

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201029

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think this is completely out of the rights of GGNRA to enforce this law. They will not only force people to move out of the city (in which I guarantee there are more people living in the city with dogs than with children) and will also put small business owners at risk in an already deteriorating economical state in CA.

Corr. ID: 3107

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201509

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is my fervent and sincere hope that the GGNRA will see fit to MAXIMIZE opportunities for dog walking on property under its aegis.

We travel with our dog - everywhere. If San Francisco and the GGNRA become unfriendlier than they already are to dogs, we will just have to cut those visits down.

This sounds like a small-impact action, but if enough dog owners follow this path, it will make a difference. There are hundreds of thousands of family dogs in this country. By taking a stand against them, you take a stand against a huge segment of the economy that comprises veterinarians, manufacturers of dog medicines and related products, dog food companies, makers of doggy accessories (beds, crates, leashes, etc.), makers of doggy poop bags and dispersers, hotels that accommodate dogs (many of them 4-stars and better), dog walkers, dog sitters, doggy day-care camps, dog portraitists, makers of clothing for people who love dogs, and on and on.

Corr. ID: 3561 **Organization:** Save Off Leash Dog Walking

Comment ID: 203495 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We, the undersigned, represent businesses that provide services to dog owners and dogs. We train dogs, sell pet food and pet supplies, walk dogs and provide a variety of other services.

We oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's proposed "dog management plan," which will severely limit off-leash dog walking and dogs in areas like Ft. Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and others, and we ask you to oppose it too. We disagree with this proposal for a variety of reasons, but we will focus here on the economic impacts for small businesses like ours:

*The GGNRA's preferred alternative will negatively impact many of our businesses, and will hit dog walking businesses especially hard.

*The proposal is harmful to our clients and customers.

*The proposal will hurt San Francisco's reputation as a dog friendly city, which currently attracts tourists interested in dog-friendly destinations.

In these economic times, we simply cannot afford to put small business owners in jeopardy. Please stand up for the dog-loving community in San Francisco and the businesses that support it. We urge you to oppose the GGNRA's proposed dog management plan.

Concern ID:

30657

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Implementing the proposed plan will not have any real benefits to natural resources, including wildlife and endangered species. The provided evidence of impacts to wildlife from dogs is not adequate to restrict their use of the parks.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1804

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191669 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a life-time naturalist, animal and bird lover, I suggest that it would be irresponsible of the department, to choose any Alternative but A or instead to do nothing yet. This would provide additional time to create a more realistic and effective alternative than is proposed in DEIS Alternatives B-E. GGNRA needs to rethink it's victimization of off-leash dogs and any proposal that severely restricts the few off-leash dog areas left in the metropolitan areas. These areas are essential to the well being of thousands of citizens. Reduction of this space for off-leash dog enjoyment will not necessarily protect endangered species nor preserve areas for future generations. Constricting the space as much as most of these Alternatives propose is unacceptable.

Corr. ID: 2810

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201107

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have read the Executive Summary of the proposed new plan and am sorry to say that I feel the purpose of the study has been totally missed. Instead of looking for ways to include dog people in the safe and sustainable use of GGNRA, you have chosen, through this draft report, to do nothing substantive to protect our natural and cultural resources but instead, recommend a decreased opportunity for visitor experiences for a major portion of the population that currently utilizes the GGNRA; and it most certainly WILL NOT reduce user conflicts, in fact, I am sure it will increase them. Finally, I see nothing in the new plan that insures park resources and values for future generations that has anything much to do with dogs and the urban, multi use park and recreation activity that have been going on in most of the referenced dog sites for the past 40 years (I moved here from LA in 1966 for school so I have been around).

Corr. ID: 4595

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209957

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The plan as proposed fails the fundamental goal of presenting a balanced evaluation of the criteria. In its evaluation of information and analyses the proposal and proposed options all assume that the goal is to reduce the existing off leash and on leash dog access to the recreation area.

There are numerous examples of this one sided approach to the analysis. First, not one preferred option increases the allowed off leash land whereas there are many instances of the preferred option reducing both the off leash and on-leash access. Second, should the preferred option be put forth and fail (e.g. result in greater damage to the natural environment), there is not one proposed remedy that reverses the change to return to the current off-leash area. Instead, the proposed remedies all call for further restrictions.

Furthermore, this one sided approach is applied regardless of the actual status of the environment or area. The preferred option is either a further restriction to existing access, a reduction of access, or the complete elimination of access. This approach is applied regardless of the type of land in question., For instance, there are numerous developed areas with mowed lawns, picnic tables, and with no wildlife present. These areas include Ft Miley which has reduced access but is a manicured lawn, Ft. Baker which has a large lawn within a circular road surrounded by a luxury hotel, and Ft. Mason's great lawn which is a mowed and manicured lawn.

Concern ID:

30658

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The proposed restrictions will increase the distance that many dog owners will have to drive in order to exercise their dogs. This is not good for the park, and increases dependence on oil for energy, as well as traffic and parking problems.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1226

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194875

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed changes to the current situation appears to be draconian at many sites. This is the wrong direction for change in energy issues and makes us even more dependent on oil.

Corr. ID: 1793

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200266

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very upset to hear that dogs may be outlawed at yet another great beach and hiking area. It just means that instead of using the trails in Marin County, I will be driving great distances each Sat. and Sun. to find hiking trails and beaches to enjoy with my dog. As it is, the only places for dog-lovers to

go are in MMWD, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, and the northern part of Stinson Beach.

Corr. ID: 2880

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202908

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my concern over the portions of the GGNRA Dog Management Plan which impact dog areas and leash requirements in San Francisco.

I am concerned for many reasons, some of which include:

- Off leash dog areas are already highly utilized and will likely exceed capacity if the management plan is implemented.
- Many dog owners will be required to drive great distances to properly exercise pets, which is not a positive thing all around or for NPS land.
- Given our urban setting, the advantages in the Management Plan simply do not outweigh the constraints; it is not an appropriate plan to apply in an urban setting.

While I agree with the basis of preservation outlined in the EIS, I feel that the plan is not balanced in a practical way with our urban environment.

- As a dog owner I understand that there are very legitimate issues to integrate owner's needs with the needs of other uses, and feel that there are more effective ways to achieve this balance than through the plan.

I hope that all alternatives can be abandoned and current use continues.

On a personal note, I had never been to most of the NPS land in the Bay Area after 8 years of residence until I became a dog owner. Now we frequently use the space in a healthful way for all. It has inspired me to volunteer on occasion and have a good impact.

In many ways which can not be quantified in the EIS, good things happen as a result of all users enjoying and respecting NPS land. I appreciate your consideration and welcome any questions. I hope we can all work together to keep the plan appropriate for an urban environment and allow everyone to use these public spaces in a positive way.

Corr. ID: 3818

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204880

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston is the **only** place in San Francisco that I can let my dogs run off leash. One of my dogs doesn't do well in enclosed dog parks, and the other has problems with recall. (The cliffs on the beach keep her from getting off of the beach.) There is no other place that I can take both of them- not even an open space like the dog park at Stern Grove. I would need to drive much further to find a place to let them run free (negative environmental impact from extra mileage by car). If there haven't been major problems with dogs, dog walkers, and dog owners in Fort Funston, I don't understand why you are considering this draconian policy.

Corr. ID: 3821

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204935

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My fear is that further restrictions to off leash dog hiking in GGNRA will have a negative impact on those few areas that remain available. And, in my case will necessitate a long drive to some area where I can hike comfortably with my dog - not a good choice economically nor for the environment.

My plea is for people not dogs. My hope is to continue to enjoy my choice of

recreation, hiking with an off leash dog, - recreation that contributes to my health and well-being and that of the many others I meet on the trail.

Concern ID:

30660

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The proposed plan does not provide enough areas for on-leash and off-leash dog walking; particularly off-leash dog walking trails. Not all dogs enjoy exercising in a confined space, and some do better on longer trail walks. The areas provided under the preferred alternative are not sufficient for dog walkers who use the GGNRA, as walking areas are greatly limited.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1329 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195083 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are not enough trails available for off-leash recreation in the Preferred Alternative. We need more. There are not enough trails with off-leash access in the Preferred Alternative.

Corr. ID: 1884 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200368 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Compliance-Based Management Strategy must go. This poison pill that will allow the GGNRA to change the status of off-leash areas to on-leash or no dogs without additional

public comment if there is not 100% compliance with the new restrictions will not work.

There are not enough trails available for off-leash recreation in the Preferred Alternative.

Corr. ID: 2911 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202480 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are not enough trails available for off-leash recreation in the Preferred Alternative. We need more. Not everyone who goes to the GGNRA plays fetch with his or her dog. Many people enjoy hiking on trails with their dogs as their companions. There are not enough trails with off-leash access in the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative severely restricts recreational access for people with dogs, a fundamental violation of the reason the GGNRA was created. In the legislation that created it, the reason for the creation of the GGNRA is listed as "the maintenance of needed recreational open space." Off-leash dog walking is among the recreational activities listed as traditionally occurring in the land that was to become the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 4134 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208571 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not go to the parks to play fetch with my dog; I enjoy hiking on trails with my dog and I am far from the only one. There are too few trails with off-leash access in the Preferred Alternative.

I disagree with the GGNRA's current preferred alternative since it greatly 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 aren't based on sound science or long-term monitoring of site specific conditions.

Concern ID:

30662

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Dogs should be banned from all areas of park property. The proposed plan does not provide enough restrictions on dogs. The proposed plan puts the recreation of dogs

as more important than the safety and recreation of some users, including children, and those who are frail or elderly.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2166 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200554 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I don't like your plan at all. Dogs, and similar animals should be banned in total from the Park property. Will the National Park accept responsibility when a person is bitten?

Corr. ID: 3852 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209309 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I wish to express my support for the National Park Service's goal of finally creating a Dog Management Plan (DMP) for Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), but I am extremely disappointed by how much of the park would remain open to pets, and I am very opposed to the proposals to allow off-leash pets in any area of the park. National Park Service (NPS) areas are not the appropriate location for dogs, let alone for dogs to be allowed off-leash.

Concern ID: 30663

CONCERN STATEMENT: Implementing these restrictions will result in more dogs being left at shelters, as their owners will not want to put up with the more difficult situations to provide exercise, resulting in more aggressive and destructive dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3005 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200827 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These dog facilities are critical to the Canine loving population and keep dogs out of our shelters. Taking these areas away from dogs will cause dogs to have unspent energy, develop aggression, and separation anxiety issues causing their owners to decide they are more work than they bargain for and shelter dumping will skyrocket. Please leave these parks alone.

Corr. ID: 3805 **Organization:** San Francisco SPCA

Comment ID: 205187 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to plead that the proposed plans to cut off-leash dog walking not be approved. The dogs of San Francisco will suffer greatly without the opportunity to enjoy off-leash time within their city. I understand the need to protect endangered wildlife and plant species but I do not believe this is the way to do it. As someone who has studied the needs of dogs and worked directly with them for several years now I am intimately familiar with the exercise requirements of these pets. If people are not able to provide their dogs with off-leash exercise many dogs will not be exercised at all. As a result, they will become restless and bored and take out their frustrations on their homes and their guardians with unruly and destructive behavior. If this becomes enough of a problem, guardians may choose to relinquish their dogs to ACC, and the shelter system does not need to be any more strained than it already is.

Corr. ID: 4642 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208823 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Behavior issues are one of the common reasons dogs are surrendered to animal shelters. Lack of adequate exercise and socialization can result in destructive behaviors at home. Inadequate access to opportunities for outdoor exercise could well result in an increase in numbers of dogs being surrendered to shelters. Are we then trading one human and animal welfare problem for another?

Concern ID: 30664

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan does not take into account impacts on guide and service dogs. Studies indicate that these dogs and their guardians are often negatively impacted by off-leash dogs, and such conflicts can be costly, as new guide dogs are very expensive. By allowing off-leash dogs in the GGNRA, the NPS is liable for problems that guide dogs encounter.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 30156 (MT1000), Comment 202303.

Concern ID:

30665

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters said the compliance-based management is unfair and overly restrictive, and opposed the plan overall because it included this element. Compliance-based management harshly targets dog walkers and is unnecessary.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3347

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203034 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The plan over restricts pet access to the GGNRA. Off leash access in areas currently designated off leash should only be restricted if there is evidence to support the restriction. Dog visitors should not be treated as park hazards except where there is evidence that they are. I object most strenuously to the proposed rule that would ban dogs in on-leash only areas based on 25% or more non-compliance with leash rules. This is an enforcement problem, not a negative impact issue that would warrant banning dogs, and should be addressed as an enforcement problem. This proposed rule is bad legislation

Corr. ID: 3599

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203726 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In general, I find that the Preferred Plan to be overly restrictive, non-inclusive, and borderline belligerent towards responsible dog owners who use GGNRA land. I am most concerned about the "Compliant-Based Management Strategy." I see no reason why this was included in the Plan other than the GGNRA positioning itself towards an outright ban on off leash areas. The inclusion of the "Compliant-Based Management Strategy" is a combative and unfair gesture against the majority of dog owners who use GGNRA land responsibly. The GGNRA is not a national park, nor should it strive to become one, and the "Compliant-Based Management Strategy" should be absent from any final plan that is adopted.

I understand that some people do not care for dogs as much as I love spending time with my dog off leash, and the problem for the GGNRA is where these two groups meet on GGNRA land. A prime example of this is Crissy Field. Crissy Field is enjoyed by locals, tourists, runners, bikers, families, children, sunbathers, kite-fliers; the list goes on and on. Because it is a popular multi-use recreation area with people who do and don't like dogs, I can understand a need for designated off leash and on leash areas at Crissy Field.

However, Fort Funston is completely different. In general, it is nowhere as popular as Crissy Field. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of people who do visit Fort Funston are there to take their dog off leash. The park is also big enough that those who do not care for dogs can easily enjoy one of the great areas away from the majority them, like the bluffs or on top of the battery. Because Fort Funston not a popular, multi-use recreation area, I see no reason to designate an on-leash area. I lived 6 years as a dog owner in the dog-friendly Pacific Northwest, and in my opinion Fort Funston is the best place for off leash dog walking that I've been to. It should stay that way.

I sincerely hope my comments and the constructive comments of other responsible dog owners show the GGNRA that although action is needed, compromises should also be made. One of the best compromises I can think of adoption of the Preferred Alternative at Crissy Field in return for the adoption of Option-A at Fort Funston, keeping it the best off leash area on the West Coast.

Corr. ID: 4363

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209107 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Finally, the Compliance-based Management Strategy should not even be considered in any plan. It goes against the fundamental principles we live by. It would punish the vast majority of responsible dog owners because of the actions of a handful of a few 'renegades'. It is comparable to saying that if the police catch enough people speeding on Highway 101, (what is enough?) then they will close Highway 101 to all traffic.

For these reasons I oppose the Preferred Alternative and the Compliance-Based Management Strategy and urge you to obey the recreation mandate of the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 4418

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207221 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I 1) oppose the Preferred Alternative as it now stands or any of the plans contained in "Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Dog Management at GGNRA" and 2) strongly oppose including a Compliance-based management strategy (the "poison pill").

I advocate, instead, a continuing dialogue between the GGNRA and SF dog owners.

Corr. ID: 4537

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203403 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With regard to safety of other citizens who share GGNRA with other dog owners/walkers like myself, I would just like to highlight a misleading and flawed statement in the DEIS which erroneously suggests that eliminating off-leash areas within the GGNRA/San Mateo County would increase public safety. In fact, the data provided by GGNRA states that dogs account for only 2% of serious safety incidents involving dogs. Of note, the vast majority of serious incidents involved people only, no dogs. If non-serious safety incidents are included, dogs accounted for only 7% of the incidents in the GGNRA.

Finally, I would like to say that a compliance-based Management Strategy cannot be part of any plan for the GGNRA.. Doing so would punish responsible dog owners like me and other voting dog owners for the bad actions of a few irresponsible owners. Further, I am also strongly opposed to Preferred Alternative because of its restrictive nature. There is no justification offered in the DEIS for major changes. I fully support the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy AND off-leash access in San Mateo County AND on new lands acquired by the GGNRA.

We vote, own homes/businesses, pay taxes, and take responsible care of our dogs.

Concern ID:

30666

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having areas where people are not allowed for the protection of wilderness is ineffective, and creates divisions of users that can result in discrimination. Implementing the proposed plan would divide the community, and create poor relations between dog walkers and the NPS. Wilderness is important, but human recreation areas are also needed.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3571

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203568 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. As an urban ecologist, I find it problematic to create exclusive wilderness areas in urban environments that are inaccessible to many of their human residents. These types of divisions often lead to class discrimination, reserving and restricting these areas to those who meet their criteria for entry.

The GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation. It was designed as an*urban recreation area*, not a pristine wilderness areas like Yosemite. In fact, the courts have repeatedly upheld the existing 1979 pet policy. They have said that it was consistent in both fact and intent with the original mandate for recreation upon which the GGNRA was founded.

This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily excludes the tens of thousands 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.

I believe that creative solutions can be found to allow dogs' presence in the GGNRA while still protecting the wild beings that live in these areas

Corr. ID: 4235 **Organization:** Save Off Leash, SFDog, Sierra Club, Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 208622 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Urban parks should be parks and not terrariums! I love nature and want to to enjoy it up close and personally. Dogs get us outside; it would be nice if all rare and endangered species had all the land they need, but I think that all-too-common humans and dogs need space to thrive as well. This is one of the most populous areas in one of the most populous states. Perfectly pristine nature preserves, although important, are not practical in urban areas.

Concern ID: 31555

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The proposed plan is unfair given that no lesser measures were taken by NPS to attempt to address the proposed issues at hand. Such measures could have included education, better fencing, and enforcement of local laws.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4713 **Organization:** Animal Care and Control Department, City and County of San Francisco

Comment ID: 227457 **Organization Type:** County Government

Representative Quote: The NPS preferred alternative with restrictions and a compliance based enforcement that could ultimately lead to an outright ban prohibiting dogs from being allowed on GGNRA property altogether does not contemplate the urban environment in which those lands sit or the interests of the people of San Francisco and the Bay Area. Moreover, this position is overly restrictive given that the NPS has not taken any intermediate steps to educate the public and users about what is required for coexistence and collaboration. In fact, the limited education that has taken place has been initiated by local dog organizations interested in preserving their access to the off-leash areas. It seems that the NPS has not attempted to implement other, less restrictive options at their disposal prior to proposing significant limitations. For example, the NPS could implement an adaptive management plan that might include signs, timed use, fencing, and/or enforcement of local or state laws similar to our local pooper scooper law, licensing laws or permitting options. Taking such steps would indicate openness to our community's concerns and to our unique Bay Area environment.

Concern ID: 31837

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan does not provide enough access to the proposed trails, as many of the trails for visitors with dogs can only be accessed by connections to trails that do not allow dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1407

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195337

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: First, the proposed alternative is unnecessarily restrictive in several ways. The contraction of off-leash lands will cause overcrowding in city dog parks and will deny a significant portion of the Bay Area residents access to the recreational open space that was defined in the legislation that created the GGNRA. As the area grows more populated and the GGNRA expands, we need more access to off-leash lands, not less. The proposed alternative also lacks any off-leash access in San Mateo County, where there was considerable access prior to the land's annexation to the GGNRA. Across the GGNRA, the proposed alternative does not provide sufficient access to hiking trails and the trails that are included in the proposal are functionally limiting due to the fact that they are not very long and many are not accessible due to connecting to trails where trails are not canine friendly.

Corr. ID: 1465

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199806

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In any event the preferred plan is utterly disrespectful of the access rights of a large proportion of the park-using public. The preferred plans take away huge amounts of access rights. This is totally against the mandate of the Park Service. Leave things they way they are please and stop eroding our access rights!

Concern ID:

31862

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters have suggested that there are other methods to protect snowy plovers, like temporary seasonal fencing when the plovers are present, which would be a successful alternative to such stringent dog walking restrictions.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2940

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202405

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is shocking to us that in some National Parks and other public lands, firearms and "sport" hunting are allowed, yet the GGNRA is considering the exclusion of pet dogs due to a perceived danger to wildlife. We support seasonal restrictions on dog and human use in areas of the park for breeding of sensitive species, but do find it ludicrous that the proposed "management" plan excludes dogs but continues to allow equestrian use and other hoofstock, with the damage that they cause to trails and other natural areas. We also support restrictions on the number of dogs controlled by any one person on the public lands. However, a complete restriction on dog use is completely unacceptable.

Corr. ID: 2943

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202413

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a 14-year resident of San Francisco, and having spent 5 years living at Ocean Beach with my two dogs, I would like to voice my opposition to the preferred alternative, and my support for a no-change policy or a new alternative, which would allow dogs everywhere that is currently off-leash, plus create sufficient off-leash opportunities in San Mateo County. Additionally, a new alternative should remove the compliance-based management strategy.

I believe the preferred alternative would substantially change my quality of life, as well as that of my dogs, by removing social and exercise outlets.

I believe that the preferred alternative violates the mandate for the "maintenance of needed recreational open space" contained in the legislation that created the GGNRA. Not everyone who goes to the GGNRA plays fetch with his or her dog. Many people enjoy hiking on trails with their dogs as their companions. There are not enough trails with off-leash access in the Preferred Alternative. The contraction of areas available for off-leash recreation will significantly compromise the park experience for people with dogs, and contribute to crowding and traffic problems, especially in San Francisco's parks, as more and more people are forced into smaller and smaller areas.

There are much less restrictive measures the GGNRA could take to protect snowy plovers, including the use of temporary "exclosure" fencing when the plovers are present. This would keep everyone, people as well as dogs, out of the area. Enforcement that targets people who intentionally disturb plovers would also help.

GC9000 - General Comment: Support Alternative A for All Sites

See comments under GC3000: Support Current Management

GC9010 - General Comment: Support Alternative B for All Sites

Concern ID: 29643

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

The GGNRA should follow the standards of other national parks, which allow on-leash dogs only in on restricted trails and areas.

Corr. ID: 667

Organization: CNPS/GGAS

Comment ID: 182594

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My only comment is that the GGNRA dog policy should conform to the dog policy in the other national parks(dogs restricted to a small area and on a leash).

Corr. ID: 3700

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202221

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Understanding the goals of the National Park Service, it would be simplest to institute the same regulations in GGNRA as are mandated throughout the NPS (i.e. "Alternative B") but, owing to the extreme politicization of this policy over the past decade, this seems to be fruitless. While I therefore understand the need for exceptions, some policies cannot be condoned in NPS areas. In particular, permitting commercial dog-walking is inappropriate. A firm limit of 3 dogs per visitor is prudent, as it is unlikely that more than this number of dogs could be reasonably controlled at any time by most people. Furthermore, if any sites are to be designated as "off-leash", they must be clearly marked and bordered, preferably fenced for the protection of other park visitors (and the dogs themselves), and to prevent damage to surrounding resources.

Corr. ID: 4683

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210174

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative B: NPS Leash Regulation.

This alternative is generally acceptable. It embodies protections for the resources which are enforced in other National Parks. It does appear to allow leashed dogs on some trails and beaches where they might be expected to be restricted in other parks.

Concern ID: 29644

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dogs should be on-leash in GGNRA for the safety and enjoyment of all visitors, including families with young children, the elderly, and those who do not enjoy having off-leash dogs in the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1818 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191809 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please accept this plea for more restrictive dog-leashing regulations and for their strict enforcement.

My wife and I are elderly with physician-prescribed walking to treat heart disease, arthritis, knee-replacement, and other deficiencies.

For 40 years, we have made North Waterfront our home city the key to our required walking program. We use Municipal Pier and The Fort Mason Meadow three or more times per week for periods of 1.5 hours each.

Each passing year brings a rising number of law-breaking owners who use their dogs as tools of the owners' aggression and hostility. Thesedog-owners go far past "civil disobedience" to show satisfaction when sending their loose dogs to charge at us while barking, growling, and snapping.

Thesedog-owners will violate any limit on their own hostility but we hope regulations which require universal leashing will be enhanced and funded to support strict enforcement.

Corr. ID: 2092 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200527 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am in full agreement with the policies outlined in the draft environmental statement. Dogs need to be on-leash everywhere in National Park areas, if allowed at all. I have seen over the years substantial degradation by dogs running off-leash and out of sight of owners on many trails in the GGNRA, not to mention the nuisance to other users of these trails who are being molested or threatened by dogs running out of control. Fort Funston is a depressing sight since dogs were allowed to free there. I hardly go there any more because the land has been so devastated. The same goes for Ocean Beach.

The preservation of natural features and wild life in the GGNRA should be the overriding principle by which any other uses are being considered. Dogs do have a largely negative impact on these, and therefore their access needs to be strictly regulated.

Considering the fact that most dog owners I have met on trails are rudely disregarding the need to keep their dogs under control, and the park does not seem to have the resources to enforce adherence to their regulations on the trails, it is absolutely necessary to keep dogs out of all sensitive areas, and where they are allowed, they need to be kept on a leash at all times. This is the only sensible solution.

Corr. ID: 2312 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195290 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My wife and I are dog lovers. We have a dog. We keep our dog on a leash. We wish other dog owners ("guardians") would do so as well. We are tired of continually having to protect our dog from off leash dogs that are allegedly under voice control but are completely out of control. We are in favor of strong leash laws in local, state and Federal parklands.

Corr. ID: 3148 **Organization:** Habitat Restoration Team

Comment ID: 202741 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I prefer to follow the national guidelines for pets in national public lands (Alternative B). It sets a dangerous precedent to enact a variance from federal regulations. The only variance I would consider is off-leash dogs on the beaches, with the exception of Muir Beach due to the possibility of full restoration there.

I am a long-time volunteer in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I have surveyed rare plants as a consultant throughout the GGNRA, including Fort Funston, and volunteered in habitat restoration for more than 25 years.

I had several encounters with dogs and none of them were pleasant. I was sitting in a fenced-off area just above a small parking lot south of the main entrance to the Fort when a large chow, off-leash, rushed at me barking and growling. His owner did not restrain the animal at all. Later I was bit by a dog as its owner watched, explaining that the dog did not like clip boards. At no time when I was censusing plants did I see any Park police. I also observed an Asian couple with a small child walking along the paths attempting to enjoy the Park. The child was no more than three feet tall and large dogs, easily her height and up to 50 pounds, were barking at her and jumping towards her. The family gathered themselves bravely and left. This is not the sort of experience visitors should encounter when they visit the park.

Corr. ID: 4330

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209464

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I BELIEVE GGNRA SHOULD RESTRICT OFF LEASH DOGS OR REQUIRE ALL DOGS ON LEASH. I HAVE BEEN WALKING AT FORT FUNSTON FOR 30 YEARS. DUE TO THE NUMBER OF DOGS OFF LEASH OR THE LACK OF RESPONSIBLE OWNERS, I AM NO LONGER COMFORTABLE WALKING THERE, ESPECIALLY ON A SATURDAY OR SUNDAY. THE DOGS HAVE TAKEN OVER.

Concern ID:

29645

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Dogs should be on-leash in the GGNRA for the protection of wildlife, particularly threatened and endangered species. Natural resources are negatively impacted by dogs off-leash.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2737

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195591

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please help protect the wildlife in Golden Gate Park by requiring dog owners to keep their dog(s) on a leash when in the park. Such a requirement would not only protect the park's wildlife but would make visiting the park more enjoyable to other patrons as well, because encountering a dog off-leash is not only disturbing to wildlife but can also be frightening to humans.

Corr. ID: 2912

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202787

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am an "amateur" bird lover and I also like dogs. The Bay Area is undergoing an explosion in the dog population, as pet owners decide to house more and more dogs—often 2 or more in a dwelling. The impact of this explosion is manifesting itself in park redesigns (often leaving for children and adults less room in which to play), lots of feces in park areas that are not cleaned up, lots of unruly dogs not responsive to owners' voice commands, and an impact on wildlife.

I favor strict leash laws at all times on GGNRA lands to protect species that might be harassed by unleashed dogs, most of whom I see do not respond to immediate voice control when meandering in beach and trail areas. Many dogs run so far ahead of their owners that commands cannot be heard (especially with winds muting the sound), so it is unrealistic that most owners can control their dogs

unleashed to adequately prevent harassment to the bird populations--or even humans. We have all witnessed owners who think their dogs will respond instantly to voice commands, only to see them have to run over to the dog to pull him off another dog or person (whether it's a menacing situation or not). Unleashed dogs on beaches or large park areas are typically less inclined to respond immediately, as they revel in the wide open freedom and react to tantalizing animal life that coastal areas offer. Most dogs cannot be expected to refrain from their instinctual behavior to explore or chase/attack wildlife. I am also concerned about joggers on beaches and small children who may find unleashed dogs somewhat intimidating

But I feel this dog population explosion trend is steadily getting out of hand when there was, for example, opposition to protection of "naturally-occurring" wildlife, such as the snowy plover--so that dogs could have more recreation areas. Wildlife, such as the snowy plover cannot make other arrangements for its breeding locations and feeding.

In general, I urge you restrict dogs to on-leash at all times, at the very least, to maintain a sense of safety for all (including wildlife) those who wish to enjoy the GGNRA. I am also supportive of barring dogs from those areas that NPS has recommended.

Corr. ID: 3391

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203135

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: my main concern is for the endangered snowy plover's habitat on the GGNRA's beaches as it winters in the same areas that many dog walkers allow their dogs to run off leash and damage the plover's nests....last i checked, the american canine is nowhere near being endangered. i encourage the NPS to reign in the owners of all dogs on the GGNRA beaches - and make a plan that mandates dogs be on leashes at all times - not only for the safety of the birds, but for the rest of us who don't care to be approached by a strange, unleashed dog when we are enjoying our peace and quiet in the GGNRA. thank you for your consideration, and, by the way, i am a dog owner who is aware of the responsibility i have to keep my dog from disturbing any wildlife habitat.

Corr. ID: 3930

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205790

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On-leash dog policy - I strongly recommend an on-leash dog policy. I do not believe that the majority of dog owners, who say they have "voice control", really have voice control. I also think it is not a good idea to have dogs off leash anywhere in the park, particularly after this last encounter with the coyote. I know if my dog was off leash, it would have been a disaster for all beings involved.

GC9020 - General Comment: Support Alternative C for All Sites

Concern ID:

29646

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Alternative C is favorable because it provides the best compromise between user groups and resources, and allows areas for both on and off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 382

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181170

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a dog owner and a park user I am in favor overall of alternative "C" in most cases. I feel that dogs should not be able to free run of park lands due to the possible destruction of natural nesting areas, harming of wildlife and unwanted attention to the public.

Corr. ID: 2176

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200630 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preferred Alternative C balances the greater interests and ought to be adopted. No one can reasonably claim to be harmed by its provisions if they value the health of the parklands.

Corr. ID: 3180 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203755 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support Alternative C - Multiple Use. I have owned a dog in the Bay Area for 10 years, and I have been a GGNPA volunteer (Golden Gate Raptor Observatory) for 2 years. I am also a conservation biologist and an advocate for wildlife and wild places. I believe in the GGNRA first and foremost as a place for native species to thrive. Migrating birds in particular face many challenges to survival. It is critical that they have places to rest, feed, and breed as they make long migrations. However, I also know that dogs make good citizens when they are well-exercised and socialized, and that generally means time off leashing playing with other dogs and people. For these reasons, I support Alternative C - Multiple Use. I am also fully supportive of the park utilizing a Compliance-based Management Strategy in which non-compliance by dog owners results in a forfeiture of rights. I love dogs, but native wildlife and the health of the ecosystems in our last wild places must come first. There are no alternatives for native species and ecosystems and cultural resources are not easily returned once lost. Dogs can be walked in neighborhoods, dog parks, regional parks and city parks.

GC9030 - General Comment: Support Alternative D for All Sites

Concern ID: 29647

CONCERN STATEMENT: *Alternative D affords the best protection of natural resources, as it is the most restrictive of dog walking. It should be chosen as the preferred alternative.*

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1471 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199822 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In order to protect the natural resources and make for a safe and enjoyable visitor experience I strongly support Alternative D. Dog threaten the fragile eco-system by digging up fragile plants and chasing native wildlife, as well as impacting the experience of the majority of users, which do not have dogs.

Corr. ID: 1538 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190717 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support increased restrictions on dogs in the NPS lands. Alternative D appears most promising to me. I hike a great deal and walk on the beach. Many dogs are not voice controllable, despite what their owners think. I have seen, for example, a dog running up and down the length of Stinson and disrupting all the birds that were feeding, with no owner in sight.

Corr. ID: 3244 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202708 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To help protect these species and other protected wildlife, inappropriate activities such as motor vehicle use on beaches were banned. However, the park continues to permit unregulated activities that disturb wildlife like western snowy plovers and marine mammals. Wildlife take refuge on Golden Gate's beaches to rest, breed, and rebuild energy for survival, yet unregulated off-leash dog recreation in these areas has resulted in habitat encroachment and wildlife harassment by dogs. The park has reported that unleashed dogs represent the most significant recreational threat to wintering western snowy plovers.

I am very much a dog person, however I don't feel that unleashed dogs should be

threatening wildlife. In my opinion, Alternative D best reflects the national park values.

Corr. ID: 3250

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202735

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative D best reflects the national park values.

While I endorse multi-use park use whenever possible, those issues must be held to a higher standard and scrutiny when endangered species and wildlife habitat are at risk. When you consider that Golden Gate Golden Gate National Recreation Area is perhaps one of our country's boldest park experiments: setting aside highly-prized land to provide a national park experience near a heavily urbanized area. Indeed, the park is home to more endangered and threatened species than any other park in the continental U.S.--more than Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Sequoia & Kings Canyon combined!

I am a lifelong National Park visitor and have been to dozens of parks across America. While Yellowstone will forever be at the top of my list, Golden Gate offers such a unique opportunity for visitors near a major metropolitan city. However, the proximity of people to this park threaten to "love it to death."

Corr. ID: 3307

Organization: National Parks Conservation Association

Comment ID: 202878

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While I agree that we need "off leash" areas for pets and their owners,

there are just some places on our coast that are too fragile for that use.

As a pet owner I don't think its a burden to seek those parks where my dogs can have fun and not disurb the local wildlife.

Just as I wouldn't want a party of teenagers right outside my house, we need to protect the ecosystem that supports the coastal wildlife, especially endangered species. I believe you should consider the below alternatives.

--The park's mission is to protect the natural and cultural resources, not allow recreation to undermine it. Alternative D best reflects the national park values.

Corr. ID: 3464

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203288

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative D best reflects the national park values. ?

I have dogs myself who are well trained and still they might do erratic things that would be a negative in this environment. Also, I find that many dog owners either do not really care, or think they have a trained dog when they do not, and essentially are unable or unwilling to make sure their dogs have no effect on this fragile environment or the wildlife living there.

Although good intentions abound there is a large "OOPS!!" factor when it comes to people or dogs and their respect for a sensitive area. I am glad that you (I hope) will strengthen the impact on this area.

Thank you for helping to create a better park experience at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and for giving imperiled species a chance to survive.?

Concern ID:
CONCERN

29648

[Dog walking restrictions under alternative D limit off-leash dog walking in many](#)

STATEMENT: areas of Golden Gate and would benefit visitor safety and experience.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 722 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182734 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I support Alternative D because it offers the most protection to natural and cultural resources and visitors wanting a safe and most dog-free experience.
Being able to have a dog-free or dog-limited (on leash only) experience would be wonderful.
Corr. ID: 2076 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200547 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I endorse Alternative D, the most protective option identified in the process.
As a parent of a young child I am frequently upset that the freedom of myself and my child to enjoy the recreation areas is marred by my child's natural fear of unknown dogs that are often larger than he is. Dogs on leash are intimidating enough when their human companions may not be fully attentive to the dogs' reach at all times, and can not stop the growling and barking which is inevitably a part of the nature of many dogs, but dogs off leash are a great concern to me in terms of worrying about my child's safety, and force me to have to regularly actively and defensively manage the distance between us, be on constant watch for approaching dogs, and to insert myself physically between dogs and my child.
Corr. ID: 3946 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 205983 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I support Alternative D. I live near Ocean Beach and have seen too many incidents of dog fights, uncollected dog excrement, children being knocked over, and dogs running through people's picnics. Although I know that there are many responsible dog owners, they are not willing or able to police the irresponsible dog owners. I also think that many dog owners overestimate their ability to control their dogs with vocal commands. I routinely see owners with off-leash dogs that do not appear to be under voice control, even when it is clear that their dogs are bothering others. Letting dogs run off-leash is a privilege not a right and this privilege has been abused.
Corr. ID: 4081 **Organization:** resident
Comment ID: 207803 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am writing because I have been in (and witnessed) numerous dangerous situations with dogs and their owners while walking the Coastal trail and I fear it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured. This trail is heavily used by joggers, tourists and hikers of all ages. In several parts, the trail is narrow, uneven, steep and bordered by cliffs. There are blind corners, tight turns and several stair cases. When dogs both leashed and unleashed are being led through these sections, it creates serious congestion and apprehension for the parties involved, as well as the potential for serious injury. Alternative D is the best proposal, because it does not allow dogs in the above-mentioned areas.

GC9040 - General Comment: Support Alternative E for All Sites

Concern ID: 29649
CONCERN Commenters support alternative E because there is a compromise between off-leash dog walking areas and areas for a no dog experience.
STATEMENT:
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1117 **Organization:** Montara Dog Group
Comment ID: 192362 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: We drive twenty miles each way to get access to safe,

legal, dog friendly land. Please do not take it away.

We request "Alternative E".

Corr. ID: 1119 **Organization:** GGNRA Association (?) / Donor

Comment ID: 192373 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Overall Options C & E seem like a good compromise and will protect the GGNRA for future generations.

Corr. ID: 3988 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207346 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I understand the need to protect wildlife and natural resources, and I accept that those efforts may require additional limitations on off-leash use of Ft. Funston. Regarding the needs of "people who don't prefer dogs," I am perplexed by the singling out of this group. In the plans for Fort Funston, the impact on "people who don't prefer dogs" seems to be the primary advantage claimed for the "Preferred Alternative (C)" over the existing system or the less-dog-restrictive Alternative E.

If I do not prefer children, or joggers with huge strollers, or the smell of meat cooking, or frisbee playing, I do not look to rules, regulations or park management to restrict access or activities in a particular park. Rather, I go to a park where I am less likely to encounter these things, or I go at a different time than those people. "People who do not prefer dogs" have many, many options for outdoor recreation in beautiful places. On the other hand, my options are limited when it comes to outdoor, off-leash exercise for my dog - state parks do not allow dogs at all, and many city parks require that dogs be leashed at all times.

GC9050 - General Comment: Oppose Alternative A for All Sites

Concern ID: 29527

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dog walkers are not following the current rules therefore these rules should not continue.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2025 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193246 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Current rules are not working. I routinely see them ignored, either thru inattention or disregard.

Concern ID: 29528

CONCERN STATEMENT: It is unfair to allow dogs everywhere as things currently are; let dogs have areas where they have already taken over, but provide areas where wildlife and the landscape have not been destroyed as a place where others can enjoy the parks.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2133 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193424 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think it is unfair to everyone (except the dog people) to allow dogs everywhere. Since the dogs have taken over Ft. Funston, why not give it to them and not let dogs at Chrissy Field, Ocean Beach, and other places so that people can enjoy the experience and birds and landscape are not destroyed.

Concern ID: 29529

CONCERN STATEMENT: Alternative A is unacceptable because it violates the NPS mandate to protect the resources of GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4683 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210173 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Alternative A: No Action (Continuation of Existing Management).

This alternative is completely unacceptable. It simply violates the National Park Service (NPS) mandate to protect the resource that comprises the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. That resource is being consumed by dogs and the people who allow them to run free in virtually every area of the park.

GC9060 - General Comment: Oppose Alternative B for All Sites

Concern ID: 29530

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Alternative B is unacceptable because it is not a balanced approach to dog management.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 213 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180660 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the balanced approach to dog management, and am completely opposed to Alternative B, which would require that all dogs remain on leash at all times.

Concern ID: 29531

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Alternative B is unacceptable because it restricts dogs to being on a leash and does not allow for off-leash dog walking which is a vital part of San Francisco life.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1677 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191078 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As I long-time city resident and dog-owner, I ask that the Committee please rule out options B and D. Dog-run areas are a vital part of what makes San Francisco the fantastic, livable, vibrant city that it is.

Concern ID: 29532

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The restriction of dogs is not a solution to preserving endangered areas, providing a variety of visitor experiences, improving visitor and employee safety, reducing user conflicts, nor maintaining park resources. In addition, the level of enforcement required by alternatives B-E would be too excessive and it would create a resentful and antagonist atmosphere.](#)

[For representative quotes, please see Concern 29495 \(PO4000\), Comment 191670](#)

GC9070 - General Comment: Oppose Alternative C for All Sites

Concern ID: 29533

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenter disagrees with alternatives B-E.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1376 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195248 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly disagree with the EIS's call for leash-only dog walking areas and alternatives B through E.

GC9080 - General Comment: Oppose Alternative D for All Sites

Concern ID: 29535

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters are against closing areas of GGNRA to on-leash or off-leash dog walking. Off-leash dog walking is a vital part of San Francisco life.

Representative Quote(s): For representative quotes, please see Concern 29531 (GC9060), Comment 191078

Corr. ID: 310 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181055 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very much against closing parts of Crissy Field and Oakwood Valley Trail all of Muir Beach, and any of the other leashed or voice-control dog areas open in the GGNRA.

Concern ID: 29536

CONCERN STATEMENT: Alternative D is an outright ban of one segment of the population

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3953 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206030 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Unlike an outright ban of one segment of the population, as is proposed in the NPS Preferred Alternative D, these efforts serve to educate and inform all visitors to the area, representing a true spirit of stewardship for the land. Additionally, these efforts will negate the need for costly reinforcement of new regulations.

GC9090 - General Comment: Oppose Alternative E for All Sites

Concern ID: 29537

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenter does not agree with the common to all elements of alternative E.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2047 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193296 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Elements common to all action alternatives is a trap door in alternative E

Concern ID: 29538

CONCERN STATEMENT: Alternative E "Most Dog-Walking Access" is misleading because the areas open to dog walking under alternative E are less than those under alternative A. This needs to be clarified in the plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4577 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209672 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been walking my dog at Fort Funston for the last 15 years and am very familiar both with the terrain and with Fort Funston's history with regard to off-leash dog-walking over that period of time. Although I regret GGNRA's proposed dog-walking restrictions in many of the areas covered by the Management Plan, I am limiting my comments to the restrictions proposed for Fort Funston because I believe that they cannot be justified by GGNRA's own research or objectives and will result in significant hardship for San Francisco's dog-owners.

Of the available alternatives, I believe that the NPS should adopt Alternative A (no action) with regard to Fort Funston because it does the most to preserve off-leash areas for dogs. In my opinion, Alternative E is misleadingly titled as providing "Most Dog-Walking Access" because in fact the areas open to dog-walking would

be less than those under Alternative A. I urge the NPS to clarify this point to the public and to take the possibility of confusion into consideration when reviewing public support for Alternative E.

Concern ID: 29539

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Alternative E is unsustainable, due to diminishing resources it cannot be funded or implemented.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4683

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210177

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative E: Most Dog Walking Access/Most Management Intensive.

The underlying concept is unsustainable. In a time of diminishing resources, there is no way this alternative can be funded or implemented. There is no funding source outside the general funds available to GGNRA. This alternative is not acceptable.

GR2010 - Geologic/Soil Resources: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 29504

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Dogs are hazardous to soil resources. Off-leash and on-leash dog walking results in soil compaction, erosion, and the creation of social trails, while dog waste alters soil chemistry. Off-leash dogs also dig, resulting in damage to dunes and other soil resources.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 660

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181523

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These animals are hazardous to humans and deleterious to the environment, which is very fragile at best. Consider, for example, the recent erosion of Ocean Beach over the past few years, destroying portions of The Great Highway. Also, there are rare species of birds in the area, like the snowy plover and others.

Corr. ID: 1160

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193467

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: last week I watched in horror as a dog owner allowed his large on-leash dog dig a 2 foot deep by 1 foot wide hole in one of the man-made grass-covered fenced-off dunes at Crissy Field. The dog must've been searching for a ground squirrel or something like that. But the dog was so big and strong, that the owner couldn't control him. The biggest problem is that owners can't control dogs that are off-leash, but some can't even control them when they are on-leash.

Corr. ID: 3701

Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Comment ID: 202227

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We believe the scientific literature is clear in concluding that both off-leash and leashed dogs significantly impact our natural environment. This conclusion was recently reinforced in a study reported in the journal *BioScience* 61(2):125-132. 2011 doi: 10.1525/bio.2011.61.2.7, "Is Wildlife Going to the Dogs? Impacts of Feral and Free-Roaming Dogs on Wildlife Populations", by Julie K. Young, Kirk A. Olson, Richard P. Reading, Sukh Amgalanbaatar and Joel Berger. This study concludes that, "dogs can significantly disrupt or modify intact ecosystems well beyond the areas occupied by people [abstract]".

Impacts to Migrating Waterbirds

Shorebird studies (e.g., Guts Don't Fly: Small Digestive Organs in Obese Bar-Tailed Godwits, Theunis Piersma and Robert E. Gill, Jr., *The Auk*, Vol. 115, No. 1 (Jan., 1998), pp. 196-203) have shown that migrating shorebirds can alter their

morphology and convert their internal organs including their digestive tracts into energy (fatty tissue) for long migratory flights. Upon their arrival at migratory feeding grounds these shorebirds need to feed continuously and studies have documented feeding up to 18 hours a day. If disturbed from such feeding they may not survive further stages in their migratory journey.

Unleashed dogs on beaches are well known to disturb feeding waterbirds thus potentially causing this delayed mortality. This is a significant impact and greatly diminishes the functional value of Ocean Beach and Crissy Field as well as Rodeo Beach and Muir Beach and other GGNRA beaches for migrating waterbirds.

Studies have also shown that leashed dogs may also disturb wildlife, Wildlife Responses to Pedestrians and Dogs, Scott G. Miller, Richard L. Knight and Clinton K. Miller

Wildlife Society Bulletin, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 2001), pp. 124-132. Impacts take place both on beaches and trails and leashed and off-leash dogs cause disturbances that affects both plants (digging up vegetation and causing erosion, as adequately explained in the DEIS) and animals. Thus all of the above arguments for choosing Alternative D as the best alternative for GGNRA apply to both leashed and off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 4282 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209049 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Current dog use of the GGNRA is unsupportable. At Fort Funston the spider web of dog trails has caused significant erosion. We have watched dogs chase shorebirds at Ocean Beach. Some people have a fear of dogs. I know those who avoid Fort Funston and Crissy Field Beach because of the large number of unrestrained dogs running around. Most importantly, unrestrained dogs are a threat to wildlife, including endangered species like the Snowy Plover.

Corr. ID: 4683 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210169 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog litter: Besides their presence, dog related litter is a significant problem. Though many owners pick up their dog's waste, there are those who do not. In fact nobody cleans up urine.

The amount of dog urine, combined with feces that is not picked-up or remains after most of it is removed causes heavily used areas like Fort Funston to smell, thus making it unpleasant for visitors who are not dog owners. It also impacts soil chemistry in ways never explained. investigated to our knowledge. or mitigated. We have no idea what the impact on soil chemistry might be, but it would seem that wherever dogs are permitted, an environmental impact report should be developed to deal with that. "That study should identify impacts on microorganisms, invertebrates, vertebrates and plants. Since our National Parks are supposed to protect the resource of each park, it seems incumbent on the National Park Service (NPS) to undertake that analysis if dogs are permitted in any part of GGNRA..

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

29505

Other factors contribute significantly to soil erosion, particularly human recreational activities like hiking, biking, and children playing, horseback riding, and Park Service activities. Many natural factors, including wind and rain, also contribute to soil erosion and compaction, not dogs. The DEIS does not report these soil impacts from other user groups.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1134 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192461 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS report accuses dogs of degrading the land and compacting the soil. (DEIS, p. xxi, p. 225) On our walks at Fort Funston, I have observed many other forms of recreation that "degrades" the soil: hikers, bikers, joggers, kite flyers, hang gliders, surfers, children rolling down dunes, horse back riders, and remote control car hobbyists. The DEIS report fails to show what soil degradation can be attributed to these activities as well as the effects of nature: wind, rain, ravens, raccoons, seismic activity, and burrowing animals. The restrictions which would confine off-leash dogs to a few acres is overly severe unless restrictions were placed on everything that affects the environment, and then only in proportion to the extent of the effect. The document should be revised to provide scientific evidence that shows the impact of all the contributors of soil degradation and the percentage of impact each contributor is responsible for. Until that time, I strongly oppose any change in the leash laws at Fort Funston.

Corr. ID: 2899

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203047

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs are not responsible for the degradation of the park, nor its trails. The vast majority of damage is from humans. Soil compaction, waste, wildlife disturbances and resources are affected by people way more than by dogs. In reality, dogs are less of a problem than the horses that are allowed on trails, the bicycles, and even by the Park Service vehicles on the fire roads!

Corr. ID: 4089

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208368

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At about 200 pounds per adult, the force that a human exerts on the soil one foot at a time would have a significantly greater impact on soil compaction in a picnic area than the force exerted by even a large 70-pound dog distributing its weight on four paws. The failure to acknowledge that human use has more impact on soils and geology in this regard, compared to dog use, uncritically loads the analysis in favor of restrictions on dogs. While there may be areas in which impacts from dogs are unacceptable, the same criterion holds for impacts from humans, and in most of these areas, dogs and humans are already excluded.

Corr. ID: 4091

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208397

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The draft Plan/DEIS states that dogs contribute to soil erosion on the east portion side of the Grassy Airfield (Pages 364 and 365) but there is no specific documentation and a recent inspection (May 2011) by this author found no visible signs of erosion as described in this document and it is unclear how any dog would be able to create such a disturbance as, most, if not all dogs, run and play on top of the Grassy Airfield.

Corr. ID: 4311

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209353

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS does not adequately address recreational components other than dogs and so one cannot logically conclude that it is the dogs/dog walkers that are causing the problems. Chapter 3, p.225, states that at Fort Funston "soil compaction is common along social trails that have been created by-- and e heavily used by--bikers, hikers, runners, and dog walkers " As a long-time Fort Funston user, I know this is true. I know also that horses are probably the biggest cause of soil compaction and feces. However, horses are not mentioned. At Ocean Beach, large foot races such as the "Turkey Trot" have taken place during the time the beach is closed to off-leash dogs because of the Snowy Plover's presence. The DEIS needs to do a more thorough job of identifying a full set of recreational components at each location where changes are proposed

Corr. ID: 4312

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209373

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This human activities impact is a case of "we have met the enemy and they is us." Or, to be more exact, they is GGNRA personnel and GGNRA contractors. The truth is that an impact on the Oakwood Valley Fire Road/Alta Avenue routes that dog walking may have is trivial compared to that perpetuated by GGNRA personnel and GGNRA contractors. Winter after winter I have seen park and contractor vehicle using Alta Avenue (and the adjacent roads) while those roads were still wet and muddy. These vehicles' wheels make ruts in the rain softened roads. The runoff from the subsequent rains run down these ruts and end up causing severe erosion of the roads. To mitigate the damage to the roads caused by your own vehicles using them in winter when the roads are wet, huge Caterpillar earth movers are brought in during the dry season, at significant expense I am sure, to scrape another 6-inches off the surface of the roads to attempt to correct the erosion. There is no need to allow park service or contractor vehicles to use these roads to perform surveillance or other maintenance activities in winter. Their use as fire roads is not required in the middle of winter. The GGNRA should create administrative rules that prohibit the use of these dirt roads by park and contractor vehicles when they are wet and muddy until they dry out, except in cases of emergency.

Concern ID: 29506

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The DEIS fails to address toxic substances and unexploded ordinances remaining at Fort Funston that could contribute to soil contamination.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4622 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207082 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Water Discharge/Erosion of Cliffs/Toxic Substances -

The DEIS fails to address the pre-existing sewer lines of San Francisco and Daly City which go under Fort Funston and discharge into the ocean. The DEIS does not address the effect on the environment of the sewer lines and the huge excavation which was performed in the last year to update these sewer lines and attempt to stabilize the cliffs which had receded 75 feet in the last 30 years due to the effects of nature (not dogs).

The DEIS fails to address the toxic substances which remain at Fort Funston due to the occupation of the site by Coast Artillery in World War II and the subsequent use as an Army Nike missile site. There is no reference to the leaching of these toxic substances and their effect on the environment. While it is true that a certain amount of mitigation of hydraulic fluid from Nike missile handling equipment still remaining on the site and still underground has been done, the very personnel performing the mitigation for the Federal government indicated they don't really know what else is underground, where all the equipment is actually located, what the current condition of that equipment is, and, last but not least, where it will leak next. The DEIS also fails to address unexploded ordinance which continues to still be discovered at Fort Funston. The DEIS also fails to address the exploded ordinance (lead) mixed into the soil throughout the site and still being discovered by even the most casual observer.

GR4000 - Geologic Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Concern ID: 29507

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Minimizing the space available for off-leash dog recreation will cause greater impacts to areas where dogs are allowed under the new plan, as dogs will be concentrated, and their impacts will be greater.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1833 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191971 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2) The results of restricting the same number of dogs on a much smaller area of land are simply not addressed. What exactly is going to happen when the same number of dogs continue to be walked on half the land (on leash) and one-third of the land (off leash)? Where is the discussion of what will certainly be exacerbated aggression, social, environmental and erosion issues that are inevitable when the same number of dogs are restricted to a much smaller area of land? Where is the discussion of the responsible dog owners and dog walkers who frankly comprise the majority of dog walkers in San Francisco? How is restricting the amount of available land going to make the minority of dog owners and walkers who are not responsible (e.g., those who don't pick up dog waste and don't monitor their dogs) magically start behaving in a responsible manner?

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192048 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The forced concentration of dogs with individual and commercial dog walkers in a severely limited space is likely to result in significant increase in conflicts between dogs/dog walkers, conflicts with other activities in the designated space, degradation of soil/vegetation in restricted space, and pressure to find other areas for off leash dog walking that are not permitted under Plan,

Corr. ID: 4302 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208955 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If GGNRA is able to provide new recreational areas for dog off-leash recreation, it would be a great compromise to the proposed restriction. The present proposed small areas will cause conflicts for both people and dogs if they restricted to a small area. Though causing severe erosion/damage to the small limited areas from over use.

GR5000 - Geologic Resources: Cumulative Impacts

Concern ID: 29508

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The impacts of humans need to be added in consideration of impacts, which currently assume there are no impacts unless dogs are present, when there will be impacts from human walking even if dogs are not present.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4405 **Organization:** Montara Dog Walking Group

Comment ID: 204930 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The baseline for comparison throughout the Draft Plan/DEIS should not be an environment in which it is assumed that there is no impact unless dogs are present, but one in which the impact of dogs is added to the impact of humans. At about 200 pounds per adult, the force that a human exerts on the soil one foot at a time would have a significantly greater impact on compacting the soil in a picnic area than the force exerted by even a large 70-pound dog distributing its weight on four paws. The failure to acknowledge that human use has more impact on soils and geology in this regard (and acceptable in many areas of a National Park), compared to dog use, unfairly and uncritically biases the analysis in favor of restrictions on dogs. While there may be areas in which impacts from dogs are unacceptable, the same criterion holds for impacts from humans, and in most of these areas, dogs and humans are already excluded.

Concern ID: 29509

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There is no evidence to back the assertion that dogs have had a long-term, cumulative moderate impact on the soil for Muir Beach. No data supporting the impacts of nutrient addition is presented.

For representative quote, please see Concern 29248 (MB1200), Comment 203793

GR6000 - Geologic Resources: Impairment Analyses

Concern ID: 29510

CONCERN STATEMENT: The impact analyses on geologic resources do not provide enough data to justify the negligible to adverse impacts presented at Rodeo Beach and other sites. The effects of erosion are not visible, and are not attributable to dogs alone if present.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4404 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209333 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposal claims that impacts to physical resources would be from negligible to ADVERSE because of dogs. That is a very open statement; to determine how to proceed, it would have to be more specific to be of any value. Rodeo Beach hasn't changed in all the years we have walked there, and I don't see how dogs have had any adverse effect on it, or how any "severe" effects could be envisioned. This needs more clarification as to exactly WHAT is meant by "adverse" impacts. Otherwise it sounds like someone who hasn't even been to these sites is merely imagining something. The same is true for Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Fort Funston. PEOPLE walking somewhere erode the soil; dogs actually cause less erosion. Enforcement of dog-waste regulations would avoid any other form of degradation that I can imagine.

HS2010 - Health and Safety: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 29730

CONCERN STATEMENT: Visitors noted that they felt their safety was compromised by having off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. More specifically, many visitors cited concerns about safety of small children when they visited the GGNRA, and noted that the current atmosphere made them avoid the parks with their children or grandchildren.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 319 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181075 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This is a liability issue as well as a health & safety issue. If the GGNRA does not get increasing complaints about injuries from dogs, it is because persons (esp., seniors such as ourselves) have avoided areas where we would otherwise have wished to walk, but can no longer do so because of threats against our health & safety. Some may say that it is only a few humans who do not walk/exercise their dogs safely & responsibly, but one dog running & jumping upon us viciously (nearly biting us on the neck) is enough to require us to return home and avoid that area in the future

Corr. ID: 727 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182737 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: So, contrary to dog owners phrase "don't worry he's friendly," I worry a lot! The stress of being around dogs raises people's blood pressure and adversely affects their health. It raises mine. It also affects my mental health. I want to go to the park to relax but instead it worsen my mental health.

Corr. ID: 2278 **Organization:** Neighbor

Comment ID: 201072 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I live in Cow Hollow and I walk on Crissy Field at least 5 times a week. I am 69 years old. The dog problem there is not going to be solved by the recommended Alternative. Dogs and their owners will still make it unpleasant, unsafe, and unhealthy for adults and especially for children.

The beaches where dogs are allowed are awful. They are basically dog bathrooms. I am sure they are a public health hazard. Innocent children wander into these areas to play. They dig in the sand and put the sand in their mouths. I am horrified. I will not take my grand children anywhere near these places.

The leashes people use for their dogs are often 20 feet long. Virtually every time I walk there I have a dog run into me, wrap a leash around me, or accost me. I have grandchildren and I fear for their safety

Corr. ID: 3909

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205568

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a resident of the San Francisco's outer Sunset District. Every time I try to enjoy Crissy Field or Ocean Beach, I leave the area because there are numerous off-leash dogs running mad under no control by their owners. I would like to go to the beach one day and actually enjoy it without fearing being attacked by off-leash dogs. I do not even attempt to go to Fort Funston as it is impossible to go there and not have a usually frightening interaction with not one, but many off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 3927

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205766

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Both Milagra Ridge and Mori Point allow dog access if on leashes. I have never seen the leash law enforced at these parks although I have always encountered dogs off leash in both these parks whenever I go.

I have experienced the following stressful situations at both parks:

-physical and emotional distress caused by uncontrolled dogs aggressively running towards my husband and/or I, and jumping on one or both of us;

-dog attacks by unleashed dogs on leashed dogs;

-several heated conflicts between myself/husband and non-compliant dog owners;

-damage and destruction to fragile native plant restoration projects by unleashed dogs running off trails;

-injury and death to indigenous animals caused by uncontrolled dogs running after and attacking them;

Corr. ID: 4278

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209073

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is too dangerous to allow any dog to roam without a leash. One never knows when a dog may bite, especially a child whose face is close to the level of the dog's mouth. Even adults may feel uncomfortable when approached by an unfamiliar dog.

It is not fair to those who use the parks to have to deal with the issue of unruly dogs off a leash, who may be running hard and inadvertently knock a child or an elderly person to the ground. Also who wants listen to barking dogs or step in dog excrement and drag that around on a shoe to one's car? Nor is it fair to place a burden on the staff to ride herd on people who do not obey the laws.

Corr. ID: 4469

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208697

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been knocked down twice by off-leash dogs. They meant no harm; they were just out of control. Once dogs are in an area, it becomes

a dog area and no other use is safe or enjoyable. How many areas like Fort Funston are you going to turn over for dog use, which essentially excludes all other uses?

Concern ID:

29731

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Visitors did not feel that the presence of dogs was detrimental to their safety. Many visitors, particularly single women or women with children, said that they felt much safer walking in the GGNRA with their dog, and would be less likely to visit the park if they could not walk with their dog. Dogs and dog walkers have improved the safety of the parks by providing a constant presence.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 253

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180835

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have NEVER once felt unsafe around off-leash dogs. They are too excited exploring and romping to pay attention to me.

Corr. ID: 649

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181452

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In addition, I have always felt much better, when my wife and children are out enjoying the beach and trails, that they have our dog with them for safety. Our dog would only lick the would-be bad guy to death, but he wouldn't know that in advance.

Corr. ID: 2899

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203050

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs CREATE safety! It is much safer for me to walk the trails with my dog than alone! And it enhances the experience I have in the Park!

Corr. ID: 3217

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202580

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have read part of the DEIS for Dog Management in Golden Gate National Recreation Area, focusing on the sections pertaining to Fort Funston, where I like to walk my dog off-leash. It seems to me that with 20 other sections in the GGNRA the NPS could leave Fort Funston as is, i.e. with minimal leash restrictions. Urban dogs are typically cooped up indoors (or, if they're lucky like my dog, also have access to small back yards) for long periods of time. An inability to run free and burn off energy can have health and behavior impacts on these dogs. They need places like Fort Funston.

I understand concerns regarding dog fights, bites and unpicked-up waste, but these really are in the minority. A percentage of humans also commit violence against each other and other species, and trash the environment, but nobody's talking about putting them on leashes. Please don't fall into the typical trap in public policy where the actions and exceptions of the minority result in inconveniences and restrictions for the well-behaved, law-abiding majority. LEAVE FORT FUNSTON ALONE!

Corr. ID: 4026

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207081

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a woman who walks all times of day (and sometime evenings) without another person with me and I feel I need my dog with me. If dogs were banned, it would make it more challenging and would take away my access to the parks. This past week my partner was stalked and chased by a coyote in the Rancho. It was snarling, yapping and came within five feet of her. Her dog stood between her and the coyote.

Corr. ID: 4033

Organization: GGNRA

Comment ID: 207153

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am mother and love having the dogs at Crissy Field. My children enjoy playing and interacting with them. It is the reason that we go to Crissy Field rather than other parks. Seeing the dogs swimming, running and

playing is a joy and only enhances our experience. Having dogs on leash only would greatly restrict this and would be a big disappointment. The dog owners we have met are very responsible and I never fear for the safety of my children. As a mother, I have a choice of going to a place where dogs are off-leash or on-leash. Parents who are uncomfortable with off-leash dogs have many options.

Corr. ID: 4092

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208420

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA trails are part of an urban environment, and I know and have heard of many stories where single women have been assaulted. It is an unfortunate aspect urban life, but needs to be addressed. I do not use trails that do not allow dogs when I am hiking or running alone. I feel that the DEIS has failed to analyze the impact of restricting the off-leash area and its impact on single women users which comprise a large number of the overall users of the area.

Corr. ID: 4224

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208957

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In all my years walking in Fort Funston and Crissy Field I have seen ZERO incidents of dogs fighting or attacking people. I have, however, run into many very frightening human characters - for example, some drunk and belligerent people camping in the bushes at Fort Funston. And I was at Fort Funston the day someone was shot and killed.

Without dogs and dog walkers, I frankly think that these areas will be much more frightening to visit and I certainly would not feel so comfortable with fewer "dog people" there. Since 99% of dog walkers are responsible, I believe it is not right or fair to punish the majority for the actions of the very few irresponsible dog owners.

Concern ID:

29732

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Dog waste is a major issue for health and safety in the GGNRA. The amount of feces and urine is concerning, and having children playing in the same areas as this dog waste is unhealthy and unsanitary. Dog feces carry many parasites and diseases.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 311

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181060

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In the summer we do not get rain for 5 or 6 months and it is unhealthy and unsanitary to have kids playing in a dog toilet. We desperately need a section reserved for people who want to use a clean beach without dealing with dried dog urine.

Corr. ID: 930

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191398

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The feces left by dogs present an infectious disease hazard. They carry a number of intestinal parasites or worms such as roundworms, hookworms, and coccidia, some of which can infect humans. They also carry Brucella, Campylobacter, Cryptosporidium, Giardia, Lyme Disease, Coxiella, Rabies, Salmonella, and Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, many of which can be transmitted by exposure to their feces or by dog bite. 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.

Corr. ID: 2802

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201099

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs at Crissy Field are a health and safety hazard as well as a threat to wildlife. They foul the sand and grass where children play, and run-off goes into the bay. Joggers get tripped as I once was, injuring my shoulder. I've stopped jogging there and long ago stopped bringing my granddaughter.

Corr. ID: 3174

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203741 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is inadequate enforcement in Marin to manage bad dog owners/walkers. Observe the environmental damage and lack of leash enforcement near Mill Valley Bayfront Park and Dog Area. Observe dog feces in the sand in children's play areas. A birthday party or social gathering for kids in many city parks results in dog feces on shoes and play balls. There is even less enforcement in the GGNRA.

Where ever dogs are allowed there will be environmental impacts and health risks to kids. The less access for dogs the better

Corr. ID: 4267 **Organization:** Law Office of David Elliott Wise

Comment ID: 209103 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I regularly see people playing fetch with their dogs in the closed Snowy Plover area, sometimes while the owner remains aloofly on the concrete promenade, while the dog runs around in the sand. Also, I have had countless experiences at the beach where dogs run up to me and my kids, off leash, and oblivious to the repeated calls of the ineffectual owner. Clearly most dogs are walking the owners, and not vice-versa. And then there is the dog poop in the sand, which, aside from being a hazard to barefoot walker, raises dangerous bacterial levels in the sea water, which is a danger to surfers, and kids playing in the surf-line alike.

Corr. ID: 4318 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209419 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have a six year old son and I frequently take him to the Crissy Field Beach, and we are constantly over-run by off-leash dogs who have taken over the beach. The dogs urinate and defecate all over the beach, and while many owners do clean up their dog's poop, some do not and no one can do anything about all the dog urine all over the beach. Kids who play in the sand are constantly exposed to this dog urine and excrement, which is both unpleasant and unhealthy. On many occasions my son has been approached by a fast running dog, which has often frightened him. I have refrained from taking my son to Fort Funston at all, despite the beautiful vistas and the interesting hang gliders, due to that park being completely overrun by off-leash dogs that spoil the park experience for anyone who is not a dog owner.

Corr. ID: 4610 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209818 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I heard that some kids got e.coli (or something) from playing in the sand

I have seen a dog maul my neighbors cat to death. I have seen kids get bit by dogs. I see dog fights all the time. I pick up dog poop EVERYDAY.

A little girl got her face severely bitten by a dog while she was playing on the beach.

Concern ID: 29733

CONCERN STATEMENT: Being able to walk a dog in the GGNRA helps maintain a healthy lifestyle. Dogs require walks, which helps owners get outside, increasing their fitness. Dog walking also provides mental health benefits by providing a social community for many people. Lastly, dog walking allows for less aggressive and safer dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1181 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 193558 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As time has passed GGNRA has become more and more restrictive to off-leash dog access...

We have an obesity crisis in this country, and our health clinics are overflowing

with people suffering from chronic diseases, many of which are caused by excessive weight. We should be doing whatever we can to make exercise an easy part of every day life. People often care more about their pets than they do their own health, and they will get up and walk for the sake of their pet. We should have places where people can walk or run for miles with their pets to improve their health, rather than forcing pet owners into neighborhood parks with no room to run for any distance. While the plight of the snowy plover may be dire- so is the plight of the health of San Franciscans. An investment of political will now could potentially save our city millions in future healthcare costs.

Corr. ID: 2201 **Organization:** Little Fluffy Clouds

Comment ID: 200706 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 3. A well-exercised dog is a well-behaved dog. Dog owners carry the responsibility for the actions of their dog. There is no evidence that allowing dogs to go off-leash, for play opportunities and socialization experiences, increases the incidence of aggression toward a person. Every reputable expert working in the field of dog behavior in the United States is of the opinion that it is likely that off-leash access decreases the likelihood of aggression. Again I have been on these very trails for the past 11 years, twice a day, and have never been attacked by a dog. Portraying dogs as aggressive and something to fear is just a tool to push the agenda of this extreme plan. Specific studies disproving that off-leash dogs are dangerous to visitors are attached at the end of this letter.

Corr. ID: 3821 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204925 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a 74-year-old woman with moderate hearing loss. These facts are pertinent because age and disability are frequently cited as reasons for not allowing dogs off leash on GGNRA lands. I hike several times a week with my dog off leash on the Rancho Corral de Tierra land between Montara and the McNee Ranch State Park.

While this is a pleasure for both of us, the more important facts relate to health and safety for me. The pleasure motivates me to get the vigorous exercise that benefits an older person. The varied terrain at Rancho Corral de Tierra makes for a good hike in conditions that are not readily available elsewhere on the coast when walking with a dog. With my dog off leash we can precede a pace best for both of us - me slowing some on the hills and my dog chasing her ball.

Corr. ID: 3836 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203760 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Recreation with dogs is not just recreation for dogs - it is for the people with the dogs (dare I day dog owners) also.

Walking (with or without a dog) lowers blood pressure, lowers rates of chronic and costly diseases, and has many other positive effects. We should be encouraging people to recreate with their dogs - not constantly attacking it.

Particularly in the case of Fort Funston and many other areas, these are former military bases. The are not undisturbed wilderness areas. To pretend otherwise is somehow to ignore the facts.

Please preserve the current system that allows people to recreate with their dogs at Fort Funston and in all other areas currently allowed.

Corr. ID: 3914 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205600 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: More and more studies are demonstrating the benefits of walking dogs for health - both physical and psychological. Off-leash areas allow

people to come together and form friendships. They are places where people can socialize and exercise, while their dogs obtain the same benefits and become better behaved in the process.

Corr. ID: 4026 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207079 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At a time when obesity is at epidemic level and free or low cost recreational opportunities for children and families are going away, the parks serve as one of the best venues for life-long health and fitness. Dogs help us to get outside and move. Therefore, if the parks allow dogs, people will get outside and walk with them and get the exercise they need. Families with dogs will have a much better level of health and fitness.

Corr. ID: 4311 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209355 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS does not address any of the beneficial effects of recreation, with or without dogs. For example, the Healthy People, Healthy Parks initiative encourages people to walk and exercise more. Statistics show, and I know personally, that having a dog encourages us to get out and to do just that. Recreational uses including dog walking have other benefits -- reduced stress, increased appreciation of the environment, better health, and increased longevity. The GGNRA must balance these benefits against the benefits of reducing the amount of land available for recreation.

Corr. ID: 4529 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209664 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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.) The health benefits of walking with one's 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.

Concern ID: 29734

CONCERN STATEMENT: The statistics provided on dog incidents do not indicate there are significant health and safety concerns related to dogs. Many of the claims made about health and safety are not shown by the numbers, particularly given the high use and visitation of sites in the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1803 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191653 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Severe restrictions are not needed to protect other park visitors from dogs. Problems with dogs represent a tiny fraction of the total incidents and citations issued by the GGNRA over the past decade. Of those incidents and citations issued to people with dogs, the majority were leash law violations, or being in a closed area, and did not reflect any safety issues between dogs and other park visitors. Target enforcement on the small number of people whose dogs misbehave, not on excluding the entire class of people with dogs from most of the GGNRA.

For example, the DEIS mentions that disease "could" be transmitted to people from unpicked-up dog feces. However there has not been a single case of dog-feces-caused human illness reported by the San Francisco Department of Health for over 50 years. A management policy should not be based on hypothetical impacts. It should be based on actual, observed impacts. Hypotheticals that are not actually seen in the GGNRA cannot be used to justify restrictions on off-leash recreation in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3777 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205142 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Problem interactions between park visitors and off-leash dogs represent a tiny fraction of the total incidents and citations issued by the GGNRA. Visitor fears of being attacked by an off-leash dog are fears based on emotion, not empirical evidence. The vast majority of citations in the GGNRA are leash law violations or being in closed or restricted areas and did not reflect any safety issues between dogs and park visitors.

Corr. ID: 4091 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208393 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: For example, Page 71 of the DEIS asserts: "Particularly on nice days, the high level and variety of visitor uses have resulted in conflicts, including intimidation, dogs knocking people over, dog-on dog fights and dogs biting people". We have looked through this 2,400-page document, and have found nothing to substantiate this anecdotal assertion. Examination of the enforcement data summary table in Appendix G of the DEIS (Page G-1 to G-2) frequently cited in the DEIS, indicates does not support this assertion and indicated limited problems (see Appendix C of CFDG comments).

Corr. ID: 4224 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208965 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: DEIS claims a major safety problem with dogs in the GGNRA. But their own data indicates dogs accounted for only 2% of 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% of incidents in the GGNRA. Dogs are not a major safety problem. As mentioned above, in all my years dog walking in the GGNRA I have never seen one serious incident involving dogs attacking people or birds but on the contrary I have heard about many serious cases, including murder, involving people-on-people incidents. I would like GGNRA to take into account the possible negative safety impacts of shrinking use by dog walkers if it was to be restricted further; including increased drug activity, prostitution, homeless encampments, assaults and robberies etc.

Corr. ID: 4363 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209106 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The study itself shows that only 2% of serious safety incidents involve dogs. Yet it claims that dogs present a serious risk. And it never even considers comparing this 2% with the numbers of women who would be accosted if they did not have dogs at their sides.

Similarly, the study claims to be interested in protecting wildlife, but the data just don't add up. First, there must be data collection at the different GGNRA sites, and then, if there is a proven harm caused by dogs (as opposed to natural predators), you must enlist professional help in finding simpler ways to solve the problem rather than going first to banning dogs. The same is true of concerns about the cliffs; instead of banning dogs you could simply install low fences.

Corr. ID: 4396 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209572 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: You worry about safety in the GGRNA. I first wondered if you were concerned about our pets falling over the cliffs at Fort Funston. That couldn't be the case because it could be so easily solved by planting native bushes and creating hedging that could erode without much loss to the Parks. If you mean dog bites and aggressive attacks on visitors, there is vague evidence for 2% of the safety problems involving our canines. 98% of the danger comes from human crime and tourists being washed off the rocks in their naivete about the ocean waves. In fact I would worry if you eliminate dogs from Ocean Beach or Fort Funston or Baker Beach or Chrissy Fields where car break-ins do occur now.

Corr. ID: 4614 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 210128 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The DEIS does not contain any user site survey of Fort Funston. Per statements of NPS public spokesman Howard Levitt, no user site survey of Fort Funston has been conducted by, or on behalf of the NPS. Throughout the DEIS reference is made to safety issues related to dog bites. The only actual data in the DEIS pertaining to dog bites is the Law Enforcement Data (Appendix G) which reflects for Fort Funston "4 bite/attack" which is useless information without a site survey of users to determine if the reported incidents are statistically relevant. Nor does the data include a description of the severity of any incident (i.e., skin broken, medical attention required, etc.) I also note the category " 10 haz cond/pet rescue" is noted to include "cases of simple assault, case of injured person, case threats" which appear to include actions of persons, not dogs. Again, without a site survey of use, these numbers are meaningless. In short, there is no statistical data as to the daily number of visitors, the daily number of dogs, and what the Fort Funston visitors are or are not doing (i.e., walking dogs, walking, hang gliding, flying radio controlled airplanes, practicing cliff rescue, watching the ocean, etc.)

Concern ID: 31538
CONCERN STATEMENT: [The impact of dog-related pathogens is not proven in the DEIS, and it is unlikely that dog waste is introducing dangerous pathogens to park visitors.](#)
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4660 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 227445 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Safety in the Park In particular, there is no public health and safety epidemic related to dog feces or dog pathogens. Even in the unlikely event that people contract these diseases the odds of serious medical issues is negligible and certainly not any more severe than pathogens from other sources, such as wildlife droppings and city street run-offs, in the GGNRA. Per the Park Service response to my FOIA request, the Park Service has no evidence of pathogen transmission in the GGNRA and is purely relying on listing of possible dog related diseases. Certainly, the 1 in 3 families in America with dogs, do not deem these to be significant risks that would cause them to not associate with dogs.

HS4000 - Health and Safety: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives

Concern ID: 29735
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Closing sections of the GGNRA to off-leash dog walking will force dog owners to walk on residential streets, increasing the safety risks to these dog walkers. These restrictions may also force dog walkers to areas that are more treacherous or dangerous, and visitors would be impacted by more safety risks.](#)
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 543 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181969 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Closing this space to dog walking eliminates any safe opportunity for dog walking in the community. Closing this space to dog walking will force me and many neighbors to walk their pets up and down residential streets (no sidewalks), many times in the dark (few streetlights). This would create unsafe conditions for the dog walkers, the dogs, and the car drivers (as most of us are).
Corr. ID: 730 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182725 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a San Francisco resident and dog owner, I am ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED to your new regulations, that will force most of us, law abiding dog owners to walk and run in other places, on the streets, creating a hazard

for ourselves, our beloved dogs and to the traffic in general.

Corr. ID: 1835

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191986

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A final issue is that the GGNRA proposal did not consider the impact of depriving dog owners of these parks and forcing us to try finding alternative areas that may be less safe or even dangerous such as the deceptive and treacherous rip tides present along the coast of many beaches in the bay area. In the last two years two women have lost their lives trying to save their dogs caught in rip tides along Northern California beaches (see references 5 and 6).

Concern ID:

29736

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having more restrictions on dog walkers will be beneficial, as it will reduce the number of dog bites that put children at risk if enforced. This would also allow those who are allergic to dogs or afraid for their safety to enjoy more areas of the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2304

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200610

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This last weekend, we were walking with our granddaughters, ages 7 and 9, where there were several dogs off leash. Although I have no doubt that the dogs were friendly enough, their enthusiasm scared both our girls, to the point of their wanting us to pick them up. also have significant allergies, that I can manage with daily medication. One close encounter with fur can set me back the rest of the day. I would like to have enjoyed our day without all the drama.

Corr. ID: 2569

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195641

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not permit dogs throughout the park, or restrict them to very small areas where one does not have to encounter them. In addition to their negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats, they have extreme negative impacts on me. I am severely allergic to dogs AND their flees. There are very few areas I can go in the Bay Area for a wilderness walk (or any walk) without encountering not just dogs and their flees, but off leash dogs that bound straight for me. If I get within 6 feet of a dog, I end up with huge, painful welts from these dog-flee encounters that take over six months to heal.??? I have been disabled for 20 years with allergies. This proposal would accommodate my disability.

When I saw your proposal to limit dogs I felt like a miracle had happened. I could really, maybe, be able to take wilderness type walks again.

Corr. ID: 2885

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202923

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the requirement that dogs be on-leash! As an asthmatic with severe allergies to dogs, I have been hospitalized in the past by "friendly" licks on the face by golden retrievers. In avoidance of dogs, I have had to abstain from many parks in San Francisco that allow dogs off-leash. I do support fenced areas for off-leash dogs to romp and play where they will not harm people like myself or small children or sensitive wildlife.

Corr. ID: 4296

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209016

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are plenty of people like me who are older, small children, frail or at least not very strong. We deserve to have a place we can get to and feel safe. Why are you choosing dogs over the safety and well-being of people? I hope that you will reconsider the recommendations in the proposed plan.

Concern ID: 29737

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan will restrict seniors and others who use the park for exercising with their dogs, resulting in negative impacts to health and safety of the visitors. Some of the on-leash restrictions proposed will present dangerous situations for those walking dogs

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1696 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191110 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Fort Funston-

I manage my dogs by voice control - I do not believe I can safely manage 6 of them on leash going down hill on rocks & sand toward the beach they covet to be at. I am afraid I would be hurt regularly even attempting this - knee? Shoulder? Head? - who know?! So would other people. Many would not even consider attempting it, thus making this area less accessible! Less accessible = very bad!

Corr. ID: 3129 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202010 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have walked my dog alone in the area north of Montara, east of Highway 1, and south of McNee Ranch State Park for 32 years, off-leash and on-leash. During this time there has never been an attempted, or a successful, molestation of a woman walking in this area. It is hilly with lots of trees and dense brush. Women often walk alone here because having a dog with you makes it safe.

At a time when obesity is a national concern, GGNRA is forgetting that the main reason people walk who have a dog, is for the dog's well being. You are encouraging people to stay at home with their dogs, and not walk.

Corr. ID: 3862 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 205574 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned that the regulations being proposed are too restrictive and are motivated by a desire to turn GGNRA into a wildlife preservation area, without consideration for the impact on human health and recreation. People living in the Bay Area tend to have a higher quality of life because of the access to the outdoor park system (of which the GGNRA is a key element) and their ability to stay fit.

I am very concerned that restricting GGNRA access to such a large number of Bay Area residents will cause a similar decline in their health. The GGNRA belongs to the Bay Area and access should not be limited so drastically in this way.

Corr. ID: 4621 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207033 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: HUMAN HEALTH and SAFETY

The impact on the health of dog walking park visitors who lose this recreational activity is not even acknowledged in the numerous discussions of "human health and safety." Walking with off leash dogs is the only regular, active, outdoor recreation many of us seniors get. Only adverse impacts on visitors and staff from the presence of dogs are considered (and exaggerated) in the DEIS. The benefits to health and safety that visitors (especially seniors) get from exercise and community are not discussed, quantified, or included in DEIS analysis.

The evidence for the health benefits to seniors from walking with a dog is too overwhelming for GGNRA/DEIS to ignore if alternatives are to be genuinely evaluated. From The Journal of Physical Activity and Health, Vol 8, Issue 3, March 2010: Researchers Reeves, Rafferty, et al. studied 5902 adults in Michigan and found the odds of doing long term physical activity were 69% higher for dog walkers than

non dog walkers. They found that among dog owners who took their pets for regular walks, 60 percent met federal criteria for regular moderate or vigorous exercise. About a third of those without dogs got that much exercise. From the American Journal of Public Health, Jan 2008: Researchers Cutt, Giles-Corti, et al. found "the adjusted odds of achieving sufficient physical activity and walking were 57% and 77% higher among dog owners compared with those not owning dogs." The New York Times of March 14, 2011 reported several other studies that reached the same conclusion. A study of 41,500 Californians found that people who owned dogs were 60% more likely to walk for leisure than those with a cat or no pet at all. This meant an extra 19 minutes a week, on average, of walking for the dog owners. In another study, seniors in an assisted-living facility improved walking speed by 28% if they walked with a dog but only 4% if they walked with a human companion.

Corr. ID: 4661 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209109 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a responsible pet owner and advocate for animals, I know it is crucial that our dogs are well behaved and trained in order to peacefully co-exist in an urban environment and adequate exercise and socialization is essential for a well-behaved dog. Having places where I can take long walks with Bianca allows me to get the exercise I need while also meeting my dog's needs. Without access to the small amount of land in the GGNRA we currently have, I am very concerned that many dog and dog guardians will not have sufficient opportunity to exercise and recreate.

Concern ID: 29738

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Crowding dogs into a smaller area or at local dog parks will result in more dog aggression, which would increase the risks to the safety of dog owners and other visitors to the GGNRA. The safety of the park will be compromised for many visitors, particularly women, in areas closed off to dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1351 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195202 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe that banning or further limiting off leash dogs will have a negative impact on park safety. A well- used park is a safe park. Seniors and women, in particular, are often reluctant to walk alone in parks because of fears of muggings or rapes. The presence of people with well-behaved dogs off leash discourages rapists, muggers, homeless people and drug dealers from hanging out in parks. Many people, especially women like myself and elder folks, walk in the GGNRA precisely because there are so many people with off leash dogs there. The dogs provide a valuable sense of safety and security.

Corr. ID: 1955 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192706 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These legislations will increase the chances of dogs getting into dangerous situations. They will also create overcrowding in the ROLA areas increasing the chances of problems in those areas.

Corr. ID: 3903 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205556 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Restricting access to dogs and dog owners would significantly have a negative impact on my lifestyle and I would no longer be able to enjoy the outdoors with my best friends. My dog allows me to visit these urban parks and feel safe to exercise and enjoy the outdoors alone without fearing for my personal safety. Please don't restrict access to the GGNRA for me and my friends.

Corr. ID: 3930 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205789 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have met more than enough crazies and creepy folks on the trails, in a variety of remote areas, to believe that I would not feel safe to appreciate our parks without him. If dogs were banned, it would take away my access to the parks. This past week I was stalked and chased by a coyote in the Rancho. It was snarling, yapping and came within five feet of my dog and me. This went on for 30 minutes before I made it back to a clear open space. My dog stood between the coyote and me and I believe without him there could have been a distinct possibility of getting bit by this animal. In all my years of hiking and walking in this area, I have never before had such an encounter, however, I was relieved that I had my dog with me

Corr. ID: 4209

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208854

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been taking my dogs to Fort Funston for several years, at least four (usually five) mornings a week. We typically stay for about an hour and a half, hiking the trails and socializing. These morning treks are a very important part of the day for both me and my dogs, and I strongly oppose significant restriction or elimination of off-leash dog walking within the GGNRA. My opposition derives not only from my enjoyment of off-leash dog walking, but also safety concerns of having a lot of dogs who behave differently on leash in a confined area

Corr. ID: 4236

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209244

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have never forgotten the testimony given by the policeman in charge of dog bites at the last attempt to restrict dogs at Ft. Funston. He stated emphatically that he expected there would be more incidences of dog bites if the measure passed for the dogs would have less outlet for their natural need to run and socialize freely.

Corr. ID: 4479

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 209663

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In closing, I would like to add that the proposal for restricting the area dogs are allowed to run off leash to certain small areas, such as a portion of Crissy Field, is going to create aggressive dog problems. Does the GGNRA not realize that forcing too many dogs into one area creates problems? This is a prescription for dog fights and worse.

Corr. ID: 4598

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210068

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Lastly, there is an issue of crime. Fort Funston is adjacent to the city of San Francisco, which, lamentably, has a big crime problem. Excluding dog-walking from a large area will put users of Fort Funston at increased risk of falling victim to violent crime, such as assaults of various kinds and robbery. It has been my experience that the presence of dogs is a deterrent to many forms of crime.

Corr. ID: 4614

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210131

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston is contiguous to the urban area of San Francisco/Daly City and within walking distance to Lake Merced which contains numerous homeless encampments. Based on the lack of any significant NPS patrol presence in Fort Funston, coupled with its natural terrain and proximity to San Francisco and Daly City, if I am denied the deterrent effect/protection afforded by the company of my dog, I fear for my personal safety which would preclude my ability to use Fort Funston.

Concern ID:

29740

CONCERN STATEMENT: Allowing unleashed dogs on narrow trails is dangerous, as this could allow people to fall off of trails.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4459 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208580 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: If the GGNRA allows unleashed animals onto these trails, some of which are so narrow at points that only single file walking is possible above 400 ft cliffs, there will eventually be an unfortunate accident and potential loss of life. The GGNRA and NPS would do well to protect themselves from potential wrongful death lawsuits by nixing this idea altogether.

Concern ID: 31783

CONCERN STATEMENT: The locations presented in the DEIS for off-leash dog walking in San Mateo are not safe; a dangerous rip tide and the possibility of large waves make these areas dangerous or unsuitable.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4035 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 207493 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The DEIS presents two off-leash areas in San Mateo County. Pulgas Ridge area is about a third of a mile long play area and in the middle of a longer on-leash hike. Esplanade Beach in Pacifica is a dangerous beach to reach and a dangerous beach for people and dogs. The beach has significant rip tides that could catch a dog and result in owner death while trying to save the dog. In addition, rogue waves could pound a person against the cliffs.

HS4010 - Health and Safety: Impacts of Dogs vs. Humans

Concern ID: 29742

CONCERN STATEMENT: Visitors have been growled at or approached by a dog in an aggressive stance. This was cited to be a point of concern among many commenters while walking along trails and other areas. Visitors felt that their safety was compromised by these dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2051 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200496 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a parent of a young child in San Francisco I'm tired of not having anywhere to go and enjoy parks and beaches without a dog terrifying my child, stepping in feces, or having dogs pee all over our sand castles (happened 5 times in 15 minutes last week on east beach in crissy field). I support a compromise that allows people and families (and people with allergies) to have certain areas off-limits to dogs and many more off-limits to off-leash dogs. My daughter just turned four and has been knocked down or chased in scary ways by untrained off-leash dogs a half dozen times.
Corr. ID: 2308 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200625 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I frequently go to Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. Many times I have been harassed by unleashed large dogs that run up to me ferociously barking as if they are going to attack me, while the dog owner is unable to get the dog to back off. I have been scared so many times that my boyfriend thinks I should carry a weapon to the beach with me.
Corr. ID: 3706 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 204311 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a frequent user of the parks, I have been concerned for some time about the increasing number of dogs allowed in the parks, particularly off-leash, and especially in beach and riparian areas. Although my primary concern is the disruption of wildlife habitat, I also feel that there are virtually no park areas left where a person can take a walk, observe nature, meditate, etc., without the

presence of dogs.

Far too often I encounter ill-trained dogs off-leash, chasing shore birds, etc., and sometimes being actively encouraged by their owners to do so. I generally find that if I attempt to approach these people to voice my concerns, I am met with hostility.

On occasion dogs have jumped up on me, sometimes quite forcefully, and I have been left with muddied clothing and in one instance a knee injury. I could go on at length about other encounters with dog owners that left me feeling discouraged and disturbed, but the gist of my point is that I do not believe that rules for either on-leash or voice-control areas are enforceable, simply because most people do not obey the rules and there is no one to see that they do. I don't think that either dogs or dog owners are inherently bad. But I do think that we have become a "dog society" in which, no matter what the rules, dog owners do not really believe that they apply to them. Alternatively, I sometimes speak to people who had no idea that dogs were not allowed in a particular section, or only allowed on-leash. If we need stringent laws, with real enforcement and penalties for breaking them to bring this about, then those laws should be implemented.

Concern ID:

29743

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Some visitors have been bitten by off-leash and on-leash dogs in the park. One common way visitors were bit was during attempts to break up a dogfight. Other visitors were nipped while running, walking, or biking.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1291

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 195023

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Last year my husband was attacked by 2 unleashed Huskies while we were hiking on Bolinas Ridge. Of course, the owner grabbed his dogs and ran away when he saw my husband's arm bleeding.

We then saw another dog walker with 6 dogs. Both within a few minutes of each other. We saw one of the 6 dogs poop and the dog walker just kept going. It was also disgusting to see dogs poop, creating a health hazard, and the owners just walk away creating.

Corr. ID: 1295

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 188948

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One person gets bitten by a dog everyday in San Francisco, so dogs aren't exactly safe. The dog that bit me in the Presidio was barking at me and not bearing its teeth or behaving in any of the ways you described. And on a bit of a separate point, the facts are that even other dog owners have problems with the professional dog walkers. Again, I find it difficult to understand the difference between me bringing well-trained de-fanged rattlesnakes to the park and dog walkers bringing their dogs to the park

Corr. ID: 3079

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 201296

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My experience with off-leash dogs has occurred mostly in San Francisco and in the Tennessee Valley area. I have never been bitten, but one of my children has. In the neck. The dog was just playing, but it was very big and the child was very small. The owner was not in control. I have no serious safety concerns now that the children are grown, but when they were small, it was a constant concern, whenever they were in a park, to protect them from dogs. Carrying them in backpacks was not always helpful, as some dogs took exception to what they seemed to view as a threatening two-headed monster. Owners would calmly explain that their huge, barking dog was "friendly." There were also numerous encounters between unsuspecting children and dog poop. All these

incidents occurred in areas where dogs were required to be leashed at all times

Corr. ID: 3221

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202603

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I like well-behaved dogs, preferably those with trained owners. I don't own a dog presently but, with hand or voice signals, can usually handle any dog that was been trained. I believe that open space is best served as available to those with and without dogs. Separating the two spaces is often best: dogs and owners can frolic and exercise in an area devoted to off-leash dogs while those desiring not to be where the dogs are can contentedly do the same elsewhere. No worries about troublesome or accidental interactions.

I come to this from experience. Here's a sample:

An off-leash boxer ran up a multi-use path toward me, jumped onto my chest, and damaged a newly healed incision. Its owner never stopped her conversation to notice, let alone control, her pet.

Riding my bike on a broad boulevard with light traffic, a Doberman ran out from a backyard obviously with a purpose, crossed the large yard, and clamped onto my ankle. He pushed me and my bike across the boulevard without letting up on his clenched jaw. No owner seen.

Walking on a sidewalk, after making eye contact with the dog walker and giving wide berth, I tried to pass a Chihuahua on-leash. The dog lunged onto my calf and dug in nails as it slid down my leg. The person reprimanded me for not wearing long pants. Nothing was said to the dog nor was the leash shortened to put distance between us.

Corr. ID: 3345

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203027

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is really important to keep dogs away from humans and wild animals. It is especially important that they not be near children, especially if they are loose

on a beach. I know of 3 cases where dogs who normally, according to their owners, were perfectly well behaved. However, 3 small children were bitten, one with a torn

face requiring painful surgery and scarred for life.

Please protect humans and wild animals for uncontrolled dogs.

Corr. ID: 3735

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204232

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I can not encourage the National Park Service more strongly to follow through with this plan. The needs of wildlife far exceed the needs of people to be able to walk their dogs off leash as they would like. The whole reason of the National Park Service is to preserve nature and wildlife for all Americans, now and in the future. As an avid hiker (I hike 20+ miles with 4-5K altitude gain once a week), I have found people with their dogs off leash in areas closed off to dogs far too many times. Just hiking I have been cornered more times than I care to remember by snarling, dangerous curs. rarely do the dog owners, or is the supposed appropriate term "guardians", apologize as they struggle to get their dogs under control. I know there are many mature, sensible and polite pet owners in the world, but having been bitten once and kept off the trails for weeks after while I healed, the inconsiderate ones are my biggest fear, as I have a right to be on the trails unmolested by supposedly domesticated animals.

Corr. ID: 4111

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208488 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I was recently bitten on the thigh while jogging near the entrance to Alta Trail by an off-leash dog, and to this day, I am nervous around any dog-large or small.

It has gotten to the point where my wife will not walk on the trail by herself, even armed with pepper spray. And our 9-year-old boy, who actually likes dogs, will not leave my side while walking the trails.

One of our concerns is that from the end of Donahue to the trailhead, there seems to be no rules at all about off-leash dogs, even though it is "private" land. We would like to encourage more enforcement of the leash laws on the trail from the parking area to the trailhead.

Corr. ID: 4339 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208917 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On this same day, after I had just deposited the first letter to you about dog encounters, I was nipped on the arm by a black laborador as I was walking on Pacifica's ocean front promenade. The dog was on leash and the owner who was holding the leash looked surprised that her dog had done that. She asked if the dog had bit me, as I was holding my arm and looking at the slobber on my jacket sieve. I said yes , and I told her she should short leash her dog. When I walk I swing my arms normally and not excessively.

I know how quickly these things happen because it happened with me and my dog on leash. It is a matter of police report that my dog bit a young person on the hand while he was passing on a skate board. We were on a four foot wide concrete side walk and my dog reacted to a hand swinging by and caught it. What I learned from that is that is from then on I had to anticipate and move my dog to the outside position and not have him in between moving people. So when you develop the rules about dogs being on leash ,you should also have suggested etiquette like place yourself between your dog and other people. Also when in tight quarters grab the leash to shorten it so that your dog is near you.

Yes I want all dogs on leash every where except on private property and dedicated dog parks.

Concern ID: 29744

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dog walkers noted that they had never seen any negative incidents between humans and dogs, and that dogfights that did occur were often very nominal.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2321 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195266 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to see data supporting the claim that there are increased problems with dogs in these areas.

I have yet to witness a dog bite or attack anyone, or any serious misbehavior. I'm sure that problems occasionally happen, but is there real evidence of a major increase in the number of problems?

Corr. ID: 3555 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203449 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am firmly against the new proposal for off leash dogs at the GGNRA. I have been walking my dog on several parcels of land managed by the GGNRA over the past ten years including Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Fort Funston, and the Presidio trails. During this time I have witnessed very few incidents of the dogs creating problems. Most dog owners have their dogs under

voice control and scoop the poop.

Making these areas on leash are going to increase incidents, not prevent them. I have seen runners and bikers get tangled up in leashes.

I would think the park police would have better things to do than chase after off leash dogs. Currently, dog owners police each other by chastising those who do not scoop or who have uncontrolled dogs off leash.

I hope the GGNRA reconsiders this preposterous proposal.

Corr. ID: 3738

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204582

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The plan states that there were 43 dog bites in the year 2007-8 in the whole area covered by the plan. Considering the huge usage by dogs and people this is a miniscule! There is no mention of human on human injury or damage during that time. In the grand scope of the GGNRA and in the city this is not a problem.

While the plan spends a lot of time trying to calculate the impact of dogs on the landscape and wildlife (a huge 45 incidents of dogs chasing wildlife), there is no consideration given to the positive effect that off leash use has on the dogs and people who use it, or the loss that would be experienced if off leash access were curtailed.

Corr. ID: 3758

Organization: SFDOG

Comment ID: 204620

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In all the years I have been going there I have rarely seen any run ins between dogs or people. If dogs get lost, someone will help you look for them.

Corr. ID: 3888

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206024

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Arriving in San Francisco, I was astonished to see - everywhere! - well-behaved, easygoing dogs trotting obediently and happily behind their owners, off leash, on the sidewalks of the city! None were snapping at children or other dogs, none were barreling ahead of their helplessly shouting owners, none were running into traffic.

As I began to spend a lot of time in the city's parks with my own dog (also a east coast transplant), it blew my mind to see the friendly, polite interactions between all the dogs playing off-leash there.

I implore you, as an animal behavior specialist and as the lucky guardian of a life-changingly wonderful dog, don't eliminate off-leash areas in San Francisco. In doing so, you would eliminate a large source of this city's canine and human happiness quotient, and would create new dog problems you couldn't even imagine.

Corr. ID: 3907

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205566

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have literally never witnessed difficulties between dogs and others, and have always found dog owners quite respectful of others and in terms of keeping the grounds clean. In fact, it has been my experience that dogs bring so much enjoyment to everyone, that it enhances the visits for everyone...whether they are there with their dogs or alone.

Please do NOT restrict the off leash areas. I am surprised this is even on the table as a current topic. There seems to be little to no impact in the areas currently enjoyed

by dogs and their people, and that there is plenty of other open space in the same parks for folks who prefer to avoid dogs to enjoy.

Corr. ID: 4175 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208750 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Even in the evenings, and on weekends, I cannot recall ever witnessing an 'incident' of a dog biting a human, or disrupting a person's enjoyment of the recreation area. This is the pattern of usage at Crissy which is real and evident to me.

Corr. ID: 4523 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209600 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In all my time at Crissy Field, I have seen very few incidents of dogs going beyond the fences that enclose the dunes or the marsh, and even fewer incidents of dog aggression. I have never seen a dog be aggressive to an adult or a child. With the many dogs that are there on weekdays, and the hundreds that are there on weekends, I think that is quite remarkable, and certainly does not justify the restrictions being put forth in the GGNRA's preferred alternative.

Concern ID: 29745

CONCERN STATEMENT: Many visitors related stories of having dogs urinate or defecate on them or their belongings, or stories of having problems with dog waste during their experience. This poses a health risk to visitors.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1169 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193541 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Thank for this work. It is long overdue. Just yesterday while coming out of the water from surfing I witnessed a woman watch her dog defecate in the shallow water and then just walk away. It happens all the time, virtually everyday. I personally have seen dogs run up and pee on innocent bystanders - children even - who just happen to be sitting on the beach.

We look forward to reasonable limits being placed upon dog owners so that the public and wildlife may once again enjoy the beach and public property.

Corr. ID: 1681 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200230 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These are the reasons I believe dog owners need to be accountable for their dogs, and why dogs need to be leashed at Rodeo Beach:

- I regularly find poop bags right on the beach or right off the trails. Many times these poop bags are just across the bridge from the "pet waste" container.

- Some owners don't even bother to pick up after their dogs. I can't walk barefoot at the beach without watching my every step to make sure I don't walk on pet waste.

- Dogs have eaten food right out of my hands when I'm picnicking on the beach.

How can I have a picnic with my friends and family when dogs are always running up to us and taking food away from us? I don't feel safe with the children around unattended dogs. What if one of them gets bitten? This can be how children become fearful of dogs in the first place.

- Just a few days ago I left my shoes and rain jacket on a piece of driftwood so I could walk in the waves. Then a schnauzer named Rocky peed on my belongings as Rocky's 5 adult companions looked on, assuring me that everything was all right. Rocky was not on a leash, nor were his owners even trying to use voice-command to control his behavior.

Corr. ID: 2307 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200623 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've seen dogs urinate in public playgrounds intended for children, while their owners looked on with amusement. Evidently, they thought it was funny. I think this is quite symptomatic of these people's mindset and attitude

to others.

HS4015 - Health and Safety: Impacts of Dog Related Incidents

Concern ID: 29746

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dogfights have resulted in injuries and even death to dogs at the park, as well as injuries to the owners.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3695 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204233 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've seen numerous dog attacks, (dog vs. dog) and also many frightened people, including myself, when dogs have charged, barked, and basically threatened people for whatever reason dogs do that. I hate going anywhere that there are no leash laws, especially in a public area. Fort Funston is also a tourist area, and it's just bad news when you have 100+ dogs running openly in a parking lot/visitor area. I would suggest a leash law in the parking lot and visitor area, and off leash for the beach and surrounding open space areas.

Corr. ID: 4277 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209082 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This is the second time in two years that I have been subjected to violence from off-leash dogs in the Presidio. Two years ago, I was walking our family dog ON A LEASH in the Presidio. Our dog was a 17 pound mutt which looked like a miniature golden retriever. She was smelling some flowers when she was attacked, out of the blue. by an off-leash Akita. I watched my animal get torn to bits by this vicious Akita. The Akita's owner happened onto the scene some moments into the attack and it took her a great deal of time, beating and screaming at her own dog before the Akita could be pulled off. We both sustained bite wounds trying to save my dog. The owner mentioned that she was surprised that the Akita attacked because the Akita hadn't attacked anyone for at least a year. (!) "We have tried to train her to use her `soft mouth' "she told me. I rushed our dog to the veterinarian where emergency surgery was performed. Although the Akita's owner paid the vet bills, our pet never recovered and died a few months later.

When I tried to report this incident to the Presidio Police, they referred me to San Francisco Animal Control. San Francisco Animal Control insisted it was not their jurisdiction. Both agencies pointed the finger at each other and ultimately, nothing happened! The only thing that happened is that a dangerous, vicious Akita undoubtedly still runs off-leash in the Presidio.

Concern ID: 29747

CONCERN STATEMENT: Condensing the spaces for off-leash dog walking will result in an increase in dog aggression, with more dogfights and altercations. On-leash dogs are also more aggressive and the increase in on-leash areas may increase conflicts between dogs. Dog incidents will increase if dogs are crowded in small areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 843 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186217 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: GGNRA's preferred alternative for Funston would limit off-leash use to the area just north of the lot, and the beach. That area would be home to a huge number of dogs, and groups would be unable to avoid other groups (and therefore, conflict, because there would be nowhere to go. Aggression is heightened for many dogs when the leash goes on, and getting your group off the trail, so another group can pass is going to be much more difficult with everyone

leashed.

Corr. ID: 1580

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190803

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2) Crowding everyone into a small off-leash area will make it dangerous for people and dogs, i.e. increase aggression + conflicts with people-people and dog-dog.

Corr. ID: 4340

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209475

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: When we first got Ozzie, we took him to enclosed dog parks. He was a year old and we weren't sure how strong his recall was. We soon stopped taking him to these parks when we realized how aggressive dogs became when they were enclosed. I actually wound up with a herniated disc after I had to pull Ozzie away from a dog who was attacking him, which prevented me from working, and walking him, for months. If you are to impose leash laws, these parks will become even more crowded than they already are

Concern ID:

29748

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Incidents between dogs are extremely rare, and are not serious when they occur.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2923

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203407

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I imagine you have received lot of letters from concerned dog owners regarding the "preferred option" on the plan. The prospect of no place to let our dogs off leash, (except for dog parks) feels bleak.

However, I have a perspective to offer rather than a complaint to make a European perspective. In England, (where I come from), and on the continent, dogs are loved. In many European cities they are allowed in café's, restaurants and shops, and across England they are allowed off leash in parks, woods and footpaths. They have space and freedom to play and it is my impression that the dogs are calmer and friendlier as a result.

I believe that society benefits from the smooth co-existence of man and dog, a reminder of our connection to nature. A society that is dog phobic and keeps dogs tethered at almost all times does not seem to be a happy, harmonious place to be, and in my opinion will only increase dog aggression and discord.

As it stands our off leash options currently stand at 1% of GGNRA space. Rather than cut this to nothing./ urge you to amend the plan to provide more off-lead recreation areas for dogs and open new lands to dog walking,

Corr. ID: 3715

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202266

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The total number of dog bites reported in San Francisco in 2004 was 384, down 20% from the number in 2003 (SFPD testimony before SF Police Commission, and private communication; this is the last year for which I have information). But - and this is a big "but" - San Francisco does not separate incidents where dogs bite other dogs from incidents where dogs bite people when it reports the total number of dog bites. Since the vast majority of dog bites involve one dog biting another, the number of people bitten by dogs is actually significantly lower than the total number suggests.

Considering the number of dogs in San Francisco, the number of bites is extremely small. Do the math: 120,000 dogs times 365 days a year equals the potential for a minimum of 44 million bites each year. The actual number is 384 (a significant number of which are dog-dog, not dog-people bites).

Reports of serious dog bites and fatal dog attacks make the news precisely because they are unusual and rare.

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.ca/injury-bles/chirpp/injrep-rapbles/dogbit_e.html).

Dog bites represented 1% of all injuries in the CHIRPP database.

The CHIRPP analysis found that children between 2 and 14 years of age sustained over 70% of all bites. Most of the dogs involved in bite incidents (65.2%) were either part of the family, part of the extended family, or part of a friend or neighbor's family. Only 12.2% were stray or unfamiliar dogs. The majority of the dog bites (64.5%) happened in someone's home (either the victim's or another person's home).

Only 3.1% of dog bites (38 total) occurred in a public park. In other words, bites occurring in locations similar to the GGNRA accounted for a miniscule 0.02% (2/100th of one percent) of the total number of 188,717 injuries in the database that year.

A majority (50.3%) of victims had been interacting with the dog before the bite: 19.3% were petting, handling, feeding, or walking with the dog; 17.5% were playing with the dog; 7.8% had hurt or provoked the dog; and 5.7% were disciplining the dog.

Corr. ID: 3715

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202267

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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 inter-dog aggression in dog parks. Dog to 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 their 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.

As is clear from all of this, the chance of being bitten in a park by a strange dog that you have not interacted with is pretty slim.

Corr. ID: 4321

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209439

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And with all the thousands of how's we have spent there over last 5 years, we have seen exactly two serious dog vs. dog altercations, and zero involving, a dog and a person.

Concern ID:

29749

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Off-leash dogs pose a threat to horses utilizing the trails. They are often aggressive towards the horses, which can spook the horses, and result in injuries to riders, horses, and dogs. Dogs also present a substantial risk to bikers, hang-glidors, and other recreational user groups.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 243

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180810

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: When riding the trails especially at a trot or canter it is totally unnerving to confront a dog off leach. There is no way to anticipate what the horse or dog will do....most dog owners feel their pet will not be aggressive toward

the large horse...they have no idea how my horse will react or what will happen to me being in the saddle 5 feet off the ground!

I realize the trails must be shared however it should be mandatory to have all dogs on leash on ALL Trails

Corr. ID: 431 **Organization:** GG Parks Conservancy

Comment ID: 181621 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Unleashed dogs present a substantial danger to bikers - I hardly know anyone who rides a bike who doesn't have a negative dog story to tell.

Corr. ID: 959 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191591 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've been attacked by a dog while riding a bike, and another dog charged 2 of us while on horseback-causing the person I was with to fall and be injured.

Corr. ID: 1429 **Organization:** Fellow Feathers of Fort Funston

Comment ID: 195371 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a five year member and prior club officer of FF of Fort Funston. Over those five years I have witnessed numerous negative encounters between park patrons due to dogs being off leash. I have witnessed pilots being bitten by such dogs while attempting to land. I have personally been chased numerous times by dogs trying to catch my glider, putting my landings at risk. I have contacted park police because one patron became outwardly violent towards a dog owner he thought was not properly controlling her animal.

Corr. ID: 2179 **Organization:** Equestrian

Comment ID: 200636 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My horse and I have been attacked by off leash dogs numerous times down on the beach below Fort Funston, once the police were involved as well as Chris Powell/GGNRA. One of the incidents, left my horse with numerous bites from an unleashed pit-bull, and a dog with a broken jaw - not the ending any animal owner wants. There have been other incidents such as these involving other equestrians, too many to count anymore.

Corr. ID: 2317 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195275 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I used to love to hike all over the GGNRA but have stopped because of the irresponsibility of too many dog owners. I've had huge, unleashed dogs run up to me and the owners threaten me when I yell, "Control your dog!". A friend was bitten while riding her bike.(The owner put the dog on leash briefly and then released it again) Another friend was bitten while hiking. Three people I know have had their small dogs bitten by other dogs (one of the dogs died and another almost did). Once, when visiting the Pacifica Pier, I had to cross the street to avoid a man who was allowing his dog to lunge and bark at people.

Corr. ID: 2572 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195638 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The needs of dog users' should not overshadow the needs of other types of park users, including runners, bicyclists, walkers, etc.

Unfortunately, members of my own family have been attacked by dogs off of leash while they (the family members) were running and biking. This is an unacceptable situation and speaks to limiting the amount of parkland where dogs can be allowed to be "off leash." Safety of park users must be a primary concern of park officials when establishing new user policies. This is especially important knowing that small children will be frequenting the park and dogs may be in close proximity to them. Having dogs on leash on trails and roads is important but it is still not without danger. It will not stop the diggers from halting their digging. It will not ensure that the owners clean up after them, etc. There must be very clear policies

and rules given to those who bring dogs into the parks

HS5000 - Health and Safety: Cumulative Impacts

There were no comments on HS5000

HV1100 - Homestead Valley: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29290

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the Preferred Alternative at Homestead Valley because of the on-leash restrictions to protect wildlife.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208892 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: We find the proposed Preferred Alternative either desirable or acceptable in the following sites, assuming the incorporation of our general comments above: Stinson Beach, Homestead Valley, Muir Beach, and Marin Headlands trails. In particular, we commend the protection of resources at Muir Beach, and the no dogs policy on the South Lagoon trail, Smith-Guthrie Loop, South Rodeo Beach and the Coastal Trail in the Marin Headlands.

Corr. ID: 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates

Comment ID: 209121 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: HOMESTEAD VALLEY FIRE ROAD AND FUTURE CONNECTOR TRAILS. The Homestead Valley Fire Road and future connector trails should be restricted to dogs on leash, if dogs are to be allowed at all on this trail to protect wildlife habitat.

HV1200 - Homestead Valley: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29294

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative A for Homestead Valley because it allows off-leash access in this area.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1269 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 194980 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Proposals for Map 3, Homestead Valley:

Strongly advocate for Proposal Map 3-A, designating this area as a voice control zone.

Please continue to permit liberal access by those who use it wisely and most often.

Corr. ID: 4414 **Organization:** Paws in Motion/Marin Pet Care Association

Comment ID: 207131 **Organization Type:** Business

Representative Quote: I recommend keeping the rules for Homestead Valley as they currently are and changing the GGNRA preferred choice for Homestead Valley to Alternative A, No Action

HV1300 - Homestead Valley: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29296

CONCERN Commenters support Alternative A for Homestead Valley because it allows off-

STATEMENT: leash access in this area.

For other representative quotes, please see Concern 207131 (HV1200), Comment 207131 and Concern 29237 (OV1300), Comment 181777.

Concern ID: 29298

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative D for Homestead Valley because it is most protective of natural resources and visitor safety.

For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29230 (MH1300), Comment 205586.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1473 **Organization:** Marin Audubon
Comment ID: 200259 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Alternative D: Muir Beach, Fort Baker, Homestead Valley, Alta Trail and Orchard and Pacheco Fire Roads, Oakwood Valley, Marin Headlands Trail
Corr. ID: 4307 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209347 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Regarding the dog management issue I support Alternative D for all of the sites in the GGNRA. I frequent all of the sites and live near the Homestead Valley and Oakwood Valley areas. I feel strongly that on-leash dogs be allowed only on the fire roads in these areas.

I have witnessed damage to plants and land by dogs. Our natural resources need protection.

HV1400 - Homestead Valley: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29295

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest in addition to Alternative A, limiting the number of dogs under voice control to 6 per dog walker at Homestead Valley.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4414 **Organization:** Paws in Motion/Marin Pet Care Association
Comment ID: 207135 **Organization Type:** Business

Representative Quote: If you feel that more regulation than Alternative A, No Action, is needed, I would recommend limiting the number of dogs under voice control to 6 per dog walker throughout the site [Homestead Valley].

Concern ID: 31549

CONCERN STATEMENT: An alternative is needed that better separates the site, allowing for off-leash dog walking, but also not promoting access to Homestead through the adjacent community.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4687 **Organization:** County of Marin Dept. of Parks and Open Space
Comment ID: 227453 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Homestead Valley is a popular dog walking area. The county has received comments supporting off leash use in the valley. Others who are residents of the valley fear that they will become a destination for dogs displaced from other newly restricted areas. The county requests that both entities' staff examine an additional way to segment the valley to accommodate some off leash use without inviting new out-of-community access through the community.

LE1100 - Lands End: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29312

CONCERN STATEMENT: The preferred alternative should be chosen as it removes off-leash dog walking, which is better suited to the area. This would also allow those who do not enjoy dogs more access to the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2105 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193360 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am not comfortable with dogs (bitten twice, once in the GGNRA) and would like to see less off leash areas. In particular, I would like to enjoy the Fort Point area, lands end, and crissy field. At the moment, I feel like I can't go to these areas or really the majority of the GGNRA.

LE1200 - Lands End: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29313

CONCERN STATEMENT: The preferred alternative is too restrictive and would have a negative impact on the experience of those who enjoy walking their dogs at the site off-leash. Dogs are not affecting wildlife and/or wildlife habitat, vegetation or other user groups, and such stringent regulation is not needed.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1446 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199690 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please don't ban well behaved off leash dogs from the Land's End Coastal Trail. Lands End is a joyous place to walk with our dog. She gets a chance to smell flowers and walks close to our side. But at the same time she feels free not being on a 6 ft leash.

Corr. ID: 3101 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201498 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I currently enjoy the areas of Lands End and Sutro Heights on a daily basis and periodically like to visit most of the other attractions in the GGNRA.

I feel the preferred alternative of the GGNRA DEIS is overly restrictive. I have seen dogs off leash in many parts of the GGNRA and like people they are mostly well behaved. If dogs are flushing birds, chasing animals, digging up plants, harassing pedestrians or fighting, their owners should be issued a hefty fine. If dog owners don't have their dogs under voice command or don't pick up the litter, they should be issued a hefty fine.

Corr. ID: 3969 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207122 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While the Preferred Alternative seems reasonable in the case of heavily-used Fort Funston and Crissy Field, it struck me as unnecessarily restrictive in several other cases, specifically:

-- Lands End: While we don't see a lot of people at Mile Rock Beach, we do see a lot of what they have left behind; I always leave the beach with a backpack full of garbage I picked up while scrambling across the rocks. The Preferred Alternative would ban dogs from Mile Rock Beach altogether -- and for the life of me, I cannot conceive of why. It is a solution in search of a problem.

-- Ocean Beach: On these walks, I'm struck by all the refuse left behind by picnickers and late-night bonfire revelers; by all the deep treads left behind by the GGNRA 4x4 trucks running back and forth on the beach; and by the fact the friendliest, most responsible beachgoers, by far, seem to be other dog owners. Like at Mile Rock Beach, I usually leave Ocean Beach with a backpack full of empty

Coke cans and Doritos bags that I've picked up along the way. Under the Preferred Alternative, the litterers will still be welcome up and down Ocean Beach, but my dogs and I will not. I can understand keeping dogs on-leash south of Stair 21 (although, I think if plovers are the prime concern, we should start by eliminating the truck traffic, bonfires, and periodic bulldozing that occur in that area), but I cannot understand the rationale for banning them entirely from that stretch of beach. The ban is not supported by the (rather methodologically thin) evidence o Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative□□□nd it is certainly not supported by my frequent firsthand experiences.

-- Baker Beach: The restrictions on beach access and elimination of off-leash recreation seem arbitrary, at best. Again, the Preferred Alternative seems like a solution in search of a problem.

-- New Lands: it really feels like the fix is in. Regardless of how the land was used prior to acquisition by GGNRA, the Preferred Alternative deems it off-limit to dogs. This approach not only disregards the fact that GGNRA is a recreation area, where the needs of the surrounding urban communities must be considered; it is self-defeating.

Concern ID: 29314

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The preferred alternative shown does not provide an adequate way to have a no-dog experience at the site.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208899 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Lands End and Fort Miley- There is some confusion, as the "Preferred Alternative" map does not match the "Preferred Alternative" description. In either case, we would note that this is another location where it will be difficult to avoid uninvited interactions with dogs. We believe that enforcement will be challenging for any allowed dog use in East Fort Miley.

LE1300 - Lands End: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29315

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters had witnessed several safety issues relating to dogs and dog walkers on the Coastal Trail, and felt that the terrain and heavy use of the trail by other visitors make it better suited for alternative D.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4463 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 208631 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: have lived in the Outer Richmond for 4 years now and am a regular visitor to Lands End. I am writing because I have been in (and witnessed) numerous dangerous situations with dogs and their owners while walking the Coastal trail and I fear it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured. This trail is heavily used by joggers, tourists and hikers of all ages. In several parts, the trail is narrow, uneven, steep and bordered by cliffs. There are blind corners, tight turns and several stair cases. When dogs both leashed and unleashed are being led through these sections, it creates serious congestion and apprehension for the parties involved, as well as the potential for serious injury. Alternative D is the best proposal, because it does not allow dogs in the above-mentioned areas

Concern ID: 29316

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters prefer alternative A. The availability of off-leash dog walking should not be restricted from the current regulations at Lands End. Restricting these areas would limit the recreational opportunities of those who enjoy having their dogs at](#)

Representative Quote(s): [the park.](#) **Corr. ID:** 4651 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209008 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Because we have a dog, we have begun to enjoy the GGNRA (even areas with no off-leash access like Sweeney Ridge). We urge you to protect the access dogs have in Funston, Ocean Beach, and Lands End. 'There should be no net reduction in those areas. I don't see how our family's recreation ' or that of the many other users we meet there ' can be served by further limiting dog access.

I believe that you serve the city, the peninsula, and much of the greater bay area by continuing to maintain the current freedom that dogs and owners have in those parks (and would make things even better for all by enforcing the restrictions at Ocean Beach). I understand that the challenges at Crissy Field are complicated and wish you the best in resolving them.

LE1400 - Lands End: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29317
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters desired the preferred alternative, but with several changes, including the removal of commercial dog walking, a limit of one dog per visitor, a compliance-based management rate of 95% or higher, and the implementation of an easy system to report violations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4584 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 210011 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Lands End ' I support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, one dog per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Concern ID: 29318
CONCERN STATEMENT: Enforcement - The use of strong fines for owners who do not follow rules would be a better solution to managing dogs at Lands End.

[For representative quote please see Concern # 29313 \(LE1200\), Comment 201498.](#)

Concern ID: 29320
CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLAs - There should be more areas for off-leash dog walking; some suggestions included allowing dogs on portions of the Coastal Trail and other minor trails, as well as along the Camino del Mar Trail.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 417 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181589 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Lands End (proposed Alternative B): Proposed on--leash in all areas. Lands End is a disappointment... whereas for many parks, the proposal limits dog access for conservation reason, at Lands End it limits dog access in interest of developing/destroying what was once wildlife habitat. This is against the GGNRA's mission for many parks, which seems a conflict. Ideally, development would cease in favor of maintaining what's left of wildlife area (ie: in favor of conservation). Where the Coastal Trail becomes a dirt path, dogs should be allowed off-leash, as well as on all other minor trails (down the cliff, toward the beach).

Concern ID: 29321

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

No Dog Areas - Dogs should be banned at Lands End to prevent off-leash dogs from affecting visitors who do not enjoy dogs. Banning dogs would also help to protect wildlife.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 124

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182009

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have nothing against pets except when they are not leashed. I feel threatened when the pets are not on leash. I prefer that pets are prohibited at Lands End.

Corr. ID: 2105

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193361

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Lands End should be closed to dogs and restored to its natural state -as a nesting area for migratory birds.

Concern ID:

30928

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

On-Leash Areas - On-leash dog walking should be required within the parking lots and the paved area of the Coastal Trail.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 417

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220168

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Lands End - However, since development surely won't cease, I suggest requiring dogs to be on leash in the parking lot and the Coastal Trail starting at Sutro Baths/Sutro Heights Park through the currently developed/paved portion of the Coastal Trail.

LP1000 - Laws and Policies: Impact of GGNRA actions on other NPS units' enforcement of servicewide policies and regulations

Concern ID:

29765

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

There is a concern that if off-leash dog walking is allowed at GGNRA then visitors may demand it at other National Parks. GGNRA should be managed like the other National Parks in regard to dog walking. Natural and cultural resources should be the focus of future policies at GGNRA; the park's mission is to protect these resources, not allow recreation to undermine them. GGNRA should keep dog walking rules consistent across all national parks.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 521

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181940

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One other concern: if dog people are allowed free rein in GGNRA, then they will begin to demand it in all the other national parks. It also opens the way for other special interests to demand their so called "rights" to these national treasures, such as off road vehicles, jet skiers, etc.

Corr. ID: 952

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191554

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: How can you possibly justify eliminating dogs because it is a 'national park' but keep having fun runs, swims, regattas...all of which bring in people who have no respect for the park or any kind of environmental aspect to anything. It's incredibly hypocritical, and just shows that you have an agenda against dogs....not an agenda to save the environment or provide a pleasant national park experience. If you would ban these events, which I would think are probably frowned upon in a national park, then maybe I would believe that you care about the environment. I don't see Yosemite telling thousands of runners to come over for a 'fun run' up to half dome. Isn't that how you are trying to sell this? That you need to manage these parks like the rest of the parks?

Corr. ID: 3418

Organization: Golden Gate Audubon Society

Comment ID: 201409 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Endangered species wildlife habitat deserves the highest level of protection from human and pet disturbance. Other national parks do not allow dogs to be off-leash and all beach areas should be free from dog recreation to protect birds.
GGNRA is on the Pacific flyway and exhausted and hungry birds need this sanctuary.
The park's mission is to protect the natural and cultural resources, not allow recreation to undermine it.

Concern ID: 29766

CONCERN STATEMENT: Off-leash dog walking should be permitted in other National Parks; GGNRA can be a model for other parks. If off-leash dog hunting is allowed in other National Parks then off-leash dog walking should be allowed at GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 651 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon
Comment ID: 182579 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: What is permitted in GGNRA should be permitted in all National Parks, and so more dogs will be off-leash in Yosemite and other parks and monuments.

Corr. ID: 1334 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195100 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs are allowed off-leash to hunt in national preserves, and other units administered by the National Park Service. Surely, if it's okay for a dog to be off-leash while it helps chase, corner and kill a wild animal, it should be okay for a dog in the GGNRA to be off-leash to play with people and other dogs.

Corr. ID: 1957 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192711 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Instead of further restricting dogs in the GGNRA, why isn't the Nat'l Park Service looking into what is right with the current GGNRA dog policy, and expanding these off leash areas throughout the rest of the Nat'l Parks?

Fort Funston, Chrissy Field, and the other off leash areas throughout the GGNRA should be reclassified as a new type of Nat'l park in which this pilot is a complete success!

Concern ID: 29767

CONCERN STATEMENT: The restrictions in the plan will affect the regulations in city parks causing more dog walking restrictions. Overriding the 1979 Pet Policy is a breach of contract and will result in public distrust of the GGNRA management. Off-leash dog walking was part of the agreement with the City of San Francisco when park land was transferred to GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1259 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194959 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With all due respect, I take issue with one of the main arguments used for reducing off-leash and leashed dog walking, which is: "it is inconsistent with NPS regulations." In 1978, the GGNRA took the position that "the ordinary guidelines outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations do not really apply in an urban area," and that "people and their animals have been visiting the park for too long to apply an all-inclusive arbitrary policy." Based on that position, the GGNRA, with a great deal of public input, drafted what is now known as the 1979 Pet Policy, which maintains the right for recreation with off-leash dogs at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Fort Miley, Baker Beach, Lands End, and Crissy Field. It seems to me that overriding the 1979 Pet Policy is a breach of contract and will

result in public distrust of the GGNRA management and leaders.

Corr. ID: 1435 **Organization:** Golden Gate Mothers Group

Comment ID: 195625 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Just to make the rules the same as other parks? GGNRA is NOT other parks. It is my understanding that free dog areas were part of the agreement that transferred the land to the GGNRA. Why renig on the deal?

Corr. ID: 1831 **Organization:** W3 Partners

Comment ID: 191965 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I completely oppose the changes that either require dogs to be leashed or prohibited from being on public lands. With open space, beaches, parks and trails being overly restrictive already for dog owners/dogs, if this is allowed to pass it will only get more restrictive and before you know it, we won't even be able to walk our dogs down public sidewalks!

Concern ID:

29768

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters have stated that the mandate of GGNRA was for the "maintenance of needed recreational space." There is no mandate that dogs should not be allowed to be off-leash.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1334 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 195098 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA is a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. The mandate for the GGNRA's creation was, according to the legislation that established the GGNRA in 1972, for the "maintenance of needed recreational open space". Off-leash dog walking was acknowledged at the time as one of the traditional recreational uses taking place in the GGNRA when it was created. In 1979, the US Congress passed a law that all national park units, including national recreation areas, national seashores, and national monuments have to be managed uniformly. "The authorization of activities shall be construed and the protection, management, and administration of these areas shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established". So there is no mandate to match the GGNRA's policies with National Park Service requirements that dogs not be allowed off-leash in a national park.

Concern ID:

29769

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters feel that the budget for the preferred alternative should be spent on enforcing existing established rules (i.e., not picking up pet waste, chasing birds).

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2943 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 202414 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Severe restrictions are not needed to protect other park visitors from dogs. Problems with dogs represent a tiny fraction of the total incidents and citations issued by the GGNRA over the past decade. Of those incidents and citations issued to people with dogs, the majority were leash law violations, or being in a closed area, and did not reflect any safety issues between dogs and other park visitors. A new alternative should target enforcement on the small number of people whose dogs misbehave, rather than excluding the entire class of people with dogs from most of the GGNRA.

Finally, the level of enforcement required by the Preferred Alternative is excessive and unsustainable. Targeting people walking their dogs irresponsibly and leaving responsible dog walkers alone would be a much more efficient use of GGNRA resources.

The DEIS states that it will cost nearly \$1million to enforce the Preferred Alternative, through the hiring of more Park Rangers or Park Police. In an era of

shrinking federal budgets, this seems a poor use of scarce financial resources. Existing Park Rangers could more easily enforce already existing rules such as picking up pet litter or no chasing of birds. These enforcement actions are all that are needed to ensure responsible dog walking and minimal impact on natural resources and other park visitors from off-leash dogs.

LU1000 - Land Use: Policies and Historical Use

Concern ID: 29847

CONCERN STATEMENT: NPS needs to consider the historical use of the land in reference to dog walking. Dog walking has been happening on this land for several decades, and there is no reason to prevent it from continuing in the future.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 88 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181902 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully support conservation efforts but I also think it is necessary to recognize the fact that a large portion of the land in question has been used for a number of years as dog accessible land. I would like to request that the competing demands to conserve the land be balanced with the need to maintain the availability of dog accessible land.

Corr. ID: 1298 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195035 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been in relationship to the GGNRA lands (particularly Ft. Funston) long before they were GGNRA. The currently proposed Dog Management Plan threatens to cut off my access to this fabulous urban recreational resource and one of the most important and beneficial aspects of my life.

Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192032 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As the DEIS states on p. ii of the Executive Summary, the lands of the GGNRA have a long tradition of dog walking, including off leash dog walking, which predates the formation of the GGNRA by decades. Dog walking is an historic, scenic and recreational value for many generations of residents who have walked dogs in these lands; enjoyed seeing their dogs at play in the GGNRA; and experienced delight in playing with a dog at the beach; having the companionship of a dog on the trails, and enjoying other forms of recreation at the GGNRA with dogs. The DEIS fails to consider fully the historic, scenic and recreational values of dog walking. The DEIS also fails to look at a "national park experience" as meaning something other than an all dogs on leash all the time in as few areas as possible. The DEIS should be revised to put appropriate emphasis on preserving the traditional values of dog walking at GGNRA and to look beyond the standard NPS dog policy for the meaning of a "national park experience."

Corr. ID: 2355 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202284 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My husband and I walk Chrissy Field at least once every week and part of our enjoyment is being around and observing the dogs and their owners. 2nd comment: just because other national parks have a particular set of rules re dogs is no reason to force the same rules on an area which has a long history of dog-citizen usage. In fact, many of the people who count on the open space for themselves and their dogs to run freely, esp.the beaches, have been going to those places since before many of the staff of the GGNRA were born. There is a long tradition of this usage. None of the proposed plans is necessary to continue dog/citizens enjoyment of the national park. Please do not adopt any of the plans.

Corr. ID: 3756 **Organization:** Can't delete check in "member," an

error. Sorry

Comment ID: 204612 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think the proposals are stunningly awful. For over 150 years the GGNRA lands and Presidio have accommodated the local public wonderfully. Even back in the 1950s when places like Fort Cronkite were in full operation (soldiers shooting on the rifle ranges etc.) hikers and dog walkers were welcome. As a boy scout we camped there. The proposed 'plan' would ruin that.

Corr. ID: 4312 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209364 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA post-dates the urbanization of the Bay Area, and is in many cases immediately adjacent to areas that were densely populated well before the GGNRA was created. For this reason, I feel that the historic usage of GGNRA land adjacent to these populated areas should be taken into consideration when formulating the dog management plan. It seems to me that the goal of the plan should be to protect the GGNRA lands as they now stand, but not attempt to turn back the clock to when the adjacent lands were rural and the GGNRA did not exist.

Concern ID:

29851

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The 1979 legislation deeded the land to NPS from the city with the purpose of continuing recreational uses, and preventing development. Dog walking, including off-leash dog walking, was considered one of these recreational uses. To restrict dog walking goes against the intended purpose of the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 860 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186255 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To decrease the size of the off-leash area is just unfair! The new plan severely restricts recreational access for people with dogs, a fundamental violation of the reason the GGNRA was created. In the legislation that created it, the reason for the creation of the GGNRA is listed as "the maintenance of needed recreational open space." Off-leash dog walking is among the recreational activities listed as traditionally occurring in the land that was to become the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 1394 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195341 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please consider the proven history of dogs coexisting with other activities and wildlife in the GGNRA for the past several decades and continue to let our parks be used as intended!

Specifically, I understand that Congress could resolve this conflict by codifying the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation, and mandating that all properties added to the GGNRA after 1979 maintain historical recreational access.

Corr. ID: 1624 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190923 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston was given to the GGNRA by the City of San Francisco on the condition that its traditional uses, including walking dogs without leashes, playing fetch, etc. would be allowed to continue. Dogs can run off leash in only 1% of the GGNRA. Please do not take that away. There is still 99% for wildlife, birds, people who don't like dogs etc.

Corr. ID: 3207 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202510 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe that the recommendations in the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan are overly-restrictive and represent a major departure from the current, balanced use of the park.

The GGNRA's goal has always been to bring the park into compliance with a federal rule (36 CFR 2.15) which bans off-leash dog walking in national parks. But the San Francisco Bay Area has a unique culture, history and community. Instead of trying to force the GGNRA to look like every other national park, the GGNRA board should respect the citizens' commission of 1979 and the unique history of the land.

I believe we should be seeking ways to make the San Francisco Bay Area friendlier to dog and cat guardians. The GGNRA's proposal is a step backwards for animal welfare in the Bay Area.

I hope the GGNRA Board will modify its proposal to be more balanced and friendlier to dog guardians.

Corr. ID: 3686 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204206 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In 1973, I voted in favor of the ballot amendment that deeded Fort Funston to the National Park Service with the understanding that the Park Service would maintain these lands for recreational purposes in perpetuity. The proposition passed in 1973. In 1979, consensus was reached with steak holders that a very small percentage of the GGNRA would be maintained for use by off-leash dogs. This was promulgated as the 1979 Pet Policy.

My wife and I are both senior citizens and have walked our dogs at Fort Funston for many years. We have seen the Park Service gradually remove portions of the GGNRA from recreational use and severely impair our recreational opportunities in our City. You have broken the promises you made to the citizens of San Francisco. Your current plan unilaterally removes these small pieces of land from use by off-leash dogs and sets aside an agreement reached through consensus building. What you are doing here is poor policy which negatively affects your neighbors greatly, and you refuse to even consider the impact your proposals will have on our city. You refuse to consider the needs and desires of the majority of park users of these tiny areas. You are proposing these changes in rules for an urban recreation area, not Yosemite or Yellowstone. Mr. Dean, I oppose your alternatives and urge you to revert to the 1979 Pet Policy.

Concern ID:

29854

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters suggest that the city has the right to revoke the deed to GGNRA if the terms of the compact are not met, and that any option that did not maintain the 1979 policies should be subject to civil action. Many commenters expressed that they feel the city should take back the land if the proposed alternatives were put in place.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 95 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181921 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Cramming thousands of dogs into smaller spaces is going to create more impact on the landscape as well as more dog-related incidents. I think the land GGNRA now stewards should be given back to San Francisco.

Corr. ID: 1770 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191529 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston was placed under the purview of the GGNRA with the condition that it be maintained for the enjoyment of dogs and horses. The GGNRA has a legal obligation to honor this condition or return the land to the city

Corr. ID: 1875 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200355 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly oppose the severe reduction in space allocated for recreation with dogs in the GGNRA. The land was given with the understanding that it would continue to be a recreation area. The other parks in the city would be overwhelmed by dogs if this plan passes. I think the land should be given back to

the city if the scope of use is changed in this way. I think that there can be balance where dog owners and non dog owners can all enjoy the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3033 **Organization:** Self

Comment ID: 201037 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The "dog management" issue is emblematic of a much larger problem, in that there is a serious lack of understanding of appropriate land-use policy when formulating design-guidelines for our parklands.

Fundamentally, the GGNRA is composed of two distinct land-use patterns whose basic criteria are at direct odds with each other: urban & wilderness.

The Presidio & Ocean Beach areas of San Francisco are an integral part of the urban-parkland fabric, within the densest urban area west of the Hudson River. Conversely, areas of the GGNRA - north of the Golden Gate and south of Ft. Funston - are part of a rural-wilderness domain that is the polar opposite, as viewed in land-use planning.

Design priorities for wilderness parks are not design priorities for urban parks.

While parks do and should contain a variety of components for the pleasure & enjoyment of visitors, the emphasis on individual park elements should be based on the overriding requirements of appropriate land-use patterns.

Examples include the following contentious design issues: Dogs vs. Snowy Plovers; Exotic Plants vs. Native Plants. In the Wilderness Park (Pt. Reyes), Plovers & Native Plants would have priority and areas for Dogs & Exotic Plants would be contained in a few, small, isolated areas only. In the Urban Park (San Francisco) Dogs, Ice-plants & Monterrey Cypress would have priority over Plovers & native plants.

The emphasis in urban parklands would be: recreation, human (& canine) activities with a few, isolated, natural areas interspersed throughout. In the Wilderness Park, the emphasis would be: sustainable natural areas, native plant restoration, and protected habitat with a few, isolated, recreation spots interspersed throughout.

The mission statements of the National Park Service (NPS) & GGNRA address Wilderness and Historical Preservation issues only. The "dna" of these agencies renders them as not an appropriate steward for San Francisco's small and limited urban parklands. Every few years, over the past two decades, the GGNRA develops another policy-ban on dogs. After years of: meetings, studies and policy changes, the issue never goes away. The GGNRA will not allow dogs within their realm.

CONCLUSION: Either the GGNRA comes up with a strict 2-park policy employing proper land-use principles or the San Francisco portion should be returned to the San Francisco Recreation & Park Department for proper care & management.

Corr. ID: 3499 **Organization:** ASPCA

Comment ID: 203397 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As originally outlined in the letter sent to you earlier, I am vehemently opposed to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. The plan proposes to either eliminate or severely limit dog-walking access in 21 locations in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo counties - including traditional off-leash areas like Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Mori Point, Muir Beach, Ocean Beach, and Rodeo Beach.

For people with dogs in the GGNRA area, located in a major urban area with minimal open space, these restrictions will have a dramatic impact, much so that those whose pets are such an important part of their family very well might consider moving where there are less restrictive rules and regulations. 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, their pets or pets of friends unable to walk their pets, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRA's original mission ("to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space"), which this plan fails to do.

To do anything opposed to the original GGNRA mission would be egregious and liable to civil action.

Corr. ID: 3993

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207426

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In all that time my dog has never had a negative environmental impact, nor has any of my dogs ever had a negative exchange with another living creature, including wildlife, other pets, or human beings.

Having said all that, I also absolutely believe that a "National Park" in a densely populated urban environment is different from a park in a pristine wilderness such as Yosemite or Yellowstone.

Much of the GGNRA land in question was deeded to the NPS by the City of San Francisco in good faith with the stipulation that traditional recreational uses be preserved. The Park Service has acted in bad faith by slowly chipping away at off-leash recreation in Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. The City of San Francisco is within its rights to rescind the gift of these areas, and if you proceed with restricting off-leash recreation in these areas, please be prepared for the City to do just that, because the dog owning community is a HUGE percentage of the SF population, and we are well-heeled and well-organized.

Concern ID:

29856

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Although off-leash dog walking may have occurred in the GGNRA historically, this does not entail that it should be continued in the future. Environmental impacts should be assessed.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29755 (GC2000), Comment 195288.

LU2000 - Other Agencies Policies and mandates Regarding Dog Management

Concern ID:

29706

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters felt that the GGNRA needed to work more closely with the city on dog management issues to establish more off-leash dog walking opportunities.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 346

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181119

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To be fair, however, if that is the most sensitive natural habitat in need of special care, then so it should be.

But then help us find a way to establish an equivalent amount of space for permanent, fenced and significant off-leash dog parks in San Francisco and our surrounding areas.

Just as certain locations are designated for the protection of local flora and fauna, it

only makes sense to set aside a number of large tracts dedicated to the health and well-being of our area's lively and loved, leashed and off-leash, canine population - and the humans who want to be with them.

Corr. ID: 1958

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192714

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Concern: How is the Park Service co-ordinating with/cooperating with SF City Government?

Corr. ID: 4213

Organization: California State Senate

Comment ID: 208875

Organization Type: State Government

Representative Quote: I appreciate that the GGNRA embraced that idea and attempted to go through the negotiated rulemaking process. While that effort was not successful, I encourage the GGNRA, in its ongoing efforts to be open, public, and fair, to continue to be as collaborative as possible as this process moves forward given the controversial nature of this issue.

I also encourage the GGNRA to extend that spirit of collaboration and work with the City to resolve this issue. The GGNRA, though federally operated, is a partner in the San Francisco community. To transfer responsibility of dealing with this problem to the city without assisting in an assessment of and plan to deal with it would be irresponsible and, more importantly, would not solve the problem.

Concern ID:

29707

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The Park Service should be coordinating with agencies that manage other trails and roads on management policies as there is a connecting network of trails, with many user groups.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2149

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193447

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is important that there be consistency between and amongst all the several agencies on road and trail use policies and standards because of the existence of a network of inter-connected roads + trails that are used by all sorts of users

LU3000 - Land Use: Dog Parks Provided by San Francisco and Other Municipalities

Concern ID:

29824

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters have stated that there are already not enough city parks that allow off-leash dog walking or parks do not allow dogs at all. Implementing the plan will only make the already crowded parks in San Francisco even more crowded. The City of San Francisco should not have to absorb the visitors from GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 223

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180699

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are already too many parks that don't allow dogs to be off leash. Let us keep the ones we have.

Corr. ID: 242

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180804

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Being able to roam freely with them on Chrissy Field, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston is invaluable, since most of the city's parks and trails, and of course all the state parks, are closed to dogs entirely.

Corr. ID: 251

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180831

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: By restricting the off-leash dog areas to such small portions of this outdoor space, when the legal places to have dogs off leash is

already extremely restricted in San Francisco, you will just make those few places so incredibly crowded and they will no longer be enjoyable locations to visit

Concern ID:

29829

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters have stated that there are plenty of alternative off-leash dog walking parks in the city. Almost all the fire roads within the open space of district parks are open to off-leash dog walking. Many of the dog parks of San Francisco are underutilized - signage is poor at some parks resulting in under use. There are hundreds of acres available throughout the San Francisco City Park system available for dogs, but only the National Parks can provide the best protection of flora and fauna. National Parks should not have to provide dog parks for local residents or areas for commercial walkers.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 112 **Organization:** n/a

Comment ID: 181976 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully support the restriction of dogs, even leashed dogs, in the parks. I believe there are sufficient dog parks scattered thru out the Bay Area that can accommodate dogs, particularly off leash.

Corr. ID: 513 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181919 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: San Francisco has 17 off-leash areas where dogs can run unfettered. That certainly should be enough.

Corr. ID: 1684 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191083 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2) GGNRA is actually being generous in providing ANY off-leash dog areas at all. Most national parks do not do this.

3) There are AMPLE other off-leash areas in Marin & SF & the East Bay, e.g. almost ALL the fire roads within open space district parks. And there are numerous dog parks everywhere. I feel the combination of these & areas provided by GGNRA provide more than enough choices/variety for any dog owner

Corr. ID: 2194 **Organization:** University of Louisville

Comment ID: 200690 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are hundreds of acres available throughout the S.F. city park system available for dogs to play in, but only the National Parks have the purview of restoring native flora and fauna. Please limit the destructive potential of visiting dogs, by requiring dog owners to be just as responsible as they claim to be. Modern leashes still provide plenty of mobility, and it's not worth sacrificing the park's biodiversity, nor the hard work of the park employees and volunteers.

Corr. ID: 2621 **Organization:** NPCA

Comment ID: 195478 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: San Francisco, and in fact most of the North and South Bay areas, have some of the most liberal dog-friendly facilities in the country. This means, in short, that there are plenty of places for dogs to run off leash dog parks to play in and areas to hike and walk on leash.

Corr. ID: 4408 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206409 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A fellow ACWC commissioner, and I recently toured all of the dog parks in San Francisco and found them to be very underutilized. Additionally, the designated areas are poorly demarcated, signage is poor, and leash laws are not enforced. The San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, over many years, has dedicated money to building fenced dog parks and designating dog play areas.

None were seen that were crowded, and many were almost completely empty. There is not a problem with not having many choices of spaces for dogs in SF, but rather a problem with distribution of the dogs across these spaces. And some dogs do not even use these spaces. In fact, many dog owners do not go to public parks at all, but rather walk their dogs in their own neighborhoods. They do not regularly get into the car to take their dogs, small ones and large ones, elsewhere.

Concern ID: 29839

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

The plan will cause more greenhouse gas emissions because visitors will now have to drive to parks that have off-lease dog walking, whereas they are walking now

Corr. ID: 25 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181466 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As residents of Muir Beach, there aren't a lot of choices for walking a dog. Muir Beach is a small community that is ringed by state and national park land. Restricting to the options that allow no dogs would only mean that we have to use our greenhouse gas polluting cars to go somewhere that allows dogs I would posit that my car harms the environment more than my dog, unless the GGNRA has evidence to the contrary to present to the public.

Concern ID: 29844

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Many commenters believe that the alternative dog parks listed in the plan are not viable alternatives to GGNRA dog walking areas. Many of the city dog parks referenced in the DEIS are not set up for off-leash dog walking - they need to be fenced since they are close to busy streets. The city parks are not comparable because visitors cannot take their dogs hiking in city parks. San Mateo County has limited off-leash dog walking areas. There are very few coastal areas in Marin County that allows dogs. Many dog parks are small confined spaces without adequate shade and access to water and some have playgrounds full of small children. The parks listed in the plan cannot support the added demand that the plan will cause.

For additional Representative Quotes, please see Concern 29329 (RB1300), Comment 192206.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1636 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190963 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -San Francisco parks are not set up for off leash use - need to be fenced to prevent dogs from going into the street

Corr. ID: 4567 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209916 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With regards to the Adjacent Parks section, the Remington Dog Park has a limit of 3 dogs per dog walker, so this is not a viable alternative to the GGNRA land and should not be even be mentioned. No dog park should be listed as an alternative adjacent park, since you cannot take dogs hiking in a dog park. Many of the 26 parks within a 5-mile radius listed are small neighborhood parks with leash laws and playgrounds full of toddlers. It is misleading to list them as alternatives to GGNRA. The only viable alternative is Marin County Open Space. These areas cannot accommodate all the dog walkers currently walking on GGNRA land without becoming overcrowded. In summary, changing the fire roads from Marin City to Oakwood Valley to leash-only access will have a huge detrimental impact on other hiking areas in the county especially in Southern Marin.

Concern ID: 31269

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

These policies are the result of the impact of other agencies restricting dog use, which has caused the GGNRA to protect itself from the influx of visitors from areas where dog walking has been restricted.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 547

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181994

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In part I see this document the result of the lack of regional management. That is, as more and more agencies listen to their lawyers and restrict dog use, less and less land is available for the walking of dogs. So, now GGNRA must protect itself as more and more people have been finding the only 'freedom' to be ahd is on certain GGNRA lands, that they in fact own (in a manner of speaking).

Concern ID:

31605

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters noted that although there is a lot of acreage provided for dog walking in the area, that there are also more dogs, and requested that this relationship be further studied.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4702

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227481

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: [Comment was originally presented at BOS committee hearing 4-11-11 by Ilana Minkoff]

At any rate, I am also curious to know ' it's been said many times today ' that our city has more acreage than any other city, for dogs ' how many more dogs do we have than all these other cities combined as well? That would be my big question, so if you could please research this issue thoroughly and support the resolution to oppose the GGNRA, both Lucy and I would really appreciate it.

LU3010 - Adjacent Lands: Impacts to other State or County Parks

Concern ID:

29629

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters either oppose or is concerned that the proposed DEIS will cause overcrowding in the remaining off-leash areas at GGNRA or at other dog parks, which may lead to overburdened dog parks, more traffic, more dog waste and/or more dog-to-dog conflicts.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 13

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181440

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: By restricting off leash walking in the GGNRA you may inadvertently destroy our neighborhood parks. There are just too many dogs and not enough parks already.

Corr. ID: 426

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181611

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If we were to loose the small off leash areas that we have currently, all SF dog walkers and owners would take over and invade the even smaller number of legal off leash SF City Parks. These displacements will inevitable cause more problems for SF residents and neighborhoods due to the lack of other options to exercise their dogs.

Corr. ID: 624

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182741

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Public health and happiness will be severely affected and there is likely to be overcrowding in other areas of the city that will be overwhelmed by the sudden influx of dogs and dog-owners who will continue to seek areas that allow off-leash recreation.

Corr. ID: 673

Organization: Private citizen

Comment ID: 182621

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Finally, restricting dog walkers to leash laws will force them to abandon the GGNRA and use more dog-friendly areas in San Francisco. This will place an unfair burden on the City Parks and Recreation Department

Corr. ID: 1407

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195334

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Our local parks were not designed to accommodate the quantity of traffic that would result from the closure of the GGNRA to owners and their dogs. The proposal passing will cause overcrowding and tensions due to overuse. It will also degrade our city parks due to sheer numbers or users, further burdening a local Parks and Rec Department already facing budget constraints.

Corr. ID: 1776

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191573

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Unfortunately, dog parks can be crowded and small and don't have enough open space for many dogs to get maximum exercise. Also, the smaller space in a dog park doesn't allow for enough space to escape from unsocialized dogs that unfortunately frequent dog parks. Overcrowding of dog parks will occur if the National Parks have off-leash restrictions ultimately causing more potential, unwelcome situations arising from unsocialized and possibly aggressive dogs.

Corr. ID: 2808

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201105

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am strongly in favor of allowing dogs off-leash in as many GGNRA areas as possible. The more places that one can walk their dog(s) off-leash, the better. I hope you will consider the impact on San Francisco if off-leash dog walking is restricted or banned in the GGNRA. Banning or further limiting off-leash dogs will have a significant negative impact on San Francisco and Marin county parks. 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 city parks far outweighs any potential negative impacts in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3997

Organization: retired

Comment ID: 207484

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I deeply resent this third attempt to largely negate the 1979 Pet Policy.

If you severely limit the off-leash area, as is planned, you will have overcrowding with it's problems.

Another issue is the Native Plant situation. Some years ago a great effort was initiated, building fences and planting native plants. Since then, these efforts have ceased. The fences are falling down and covered with sand. Planted areas are filled with weeds and no effort is being expended to maintain them.

One other aspect to this effort to severely limit the off-leash area is on our local San Francisco Parks that allow off-leash dog walking. One example is Stern Grove. Recently, when Fort Funston was closed for a day due to the Tsunami warning, many dog walkers including some professional dog walkers with multiple dogs, converged on Stern Grove, increasing the number of dogs from the usual fifty to between two and three hundred. According to the local San Franciscans who utilize Stern Grove on a daily basis, this created a very unstable and over-crowded situation. Other San Francisco dog friendly parks will also be negatively affected.

Fort Funston does not exist in a vacuum.

Corr. ID: 4201

Organization: self, City College of San Francisco employee

Comment ID: 208837

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Any attempt to make GGNRA areas off limits to unleashed dogs (except for areas enclosed for habitat restoration & for the safety of the dogs, say, from traffic) will ultimately put unbearable pressure on City parks- particularly Golden Gate Park. This pressure would not just be on professional and semi-professional dog-walkers; it would be an unacceptable hardship on dog owners and their dogs (some of whom rely on dog-walkers), who would be crowded into fewer and smaller spaces, which would embitter the current pleasant social interactions between people and between dogs, and where parking is already a problem. Golden Gate Park is already approaching the breaking point.

Concern ID:

29630

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters have stated that the proposed DEIS did not adequately evaluate the environmental and social impacts to other nearby city parks and playgrounds where visitors will begin to use for dog walking due to changes in the regulations at GGNRA. The EIS should include the number of dog walkers at each site and the number of dog walkers expected to move to other dog walking areas due to change in regulations.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 593

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 182149

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Without a valid environmental impact report indicating that the current usage is having a negative impact on the GGNRA, there's no reason this proposal should be accepted. The proposal fails to consider how it will impact City parks and playground if people are forced off GGNRA land. It's just makes no sense to change the policy now, with more and more people living in the Bay Area and coming to the GGNRA with their dogs.

Corr. ID: 1332

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 195089

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS does not adequately address dispersion issues. The DEIS 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. Even more importantly, the DEIS does not address the environmental and social impact on small, neighborhood parks in cities like San Francisco next to the GGNRA. 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. 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 DEIS suggests people with dogs go.

Corr. ID: 3737

Organization: SF Dog Owners Group

Comment ID: 204249

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Recreation - The GGNRA has a recreation mandate and the DEIS treats recreation as an adverse impact, rather than a value to be preserved. DEIS should add section evaluating benefits of recreation.

Urban Environment - The GGNRA is in a dense urban area, yet the DEIS is written

as if the Bay Area and its residents don't exist just outside its boundaries. This is an urban area, not a pristine wilderness. 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.

Corr. ID: 4213 **Organization:** California State Senate

Comment ID: 208873 **Organization Type:** State Government

Representative Quote: 2) Consideration of Impact on City Parks

The draft plan does not adequately consider or evaluate potential impacts on city parks. Rather, the draft plan appears to concentrate on economic factors such as impacts on nearby businesses and commercial dog walking, while grazing over potential changes in park use behaviors and the effect on city parks. The ultimate conclusion that the "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" (1) is incomplete and inadequate.

I believe the GGNRA is mistaken and misguided in its reasoning on this point, and that the impacts on city infrastructure should be fully evaluated and addressed in the revised plan.

Corr. ID: 4311 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209357 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Chapter 4, which discusses environmental impacts, should include a thorough discussion of the impacts to the San Francisco urban environment and to our city parks. However, these impacts have clearly not been analyzed. The discussion of each area contains essentially the same phrases, that there are 38 parks with a 10-mile radius and that the effects of increased use are not expected to be great. On p.424-, the DEIS states that impacts to Lake Merced, the closet off-leash park to Fort Funston, would be minor since not all dog walkers would stop using Fort Funston. But there are no numbers to support this. The DEIS must include the number of dog walkers currently visiting Fort Funston, the number expected to move to other areas, the acreage available to off-leash dog walking now and with the preferred alternative at Fort Funston, and the acreage available to off-leash dog walking in the Lake Merced area.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

29631

There are concerns that the proposed DEIS will cause environmental issues or unpleasant visitor experience at other parks.

Corr. ID: 400 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181192 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I really understand how eroded the dunes are getting from overuse by dogs, but believe the impact on local parks, enclosed dog parks, and any other recreation area that allows dogs will cause much worse damage.

Corr. ID: 1015 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191778 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the ban on dogs in GGRNA, but I am also concerned about the impact of the law on other parks in the city. I used to love to walk on the beach at Chrissy Field, but have stopped visiting the park because of the large numbers of dogs there. My husband won't go there either, because of the dogs. I am concerned that the public parks in the center of SF will become more populated with dogs than before however. I live within walking distance of Duboce Park and Alamo Square park, where the dog owners often flaunt the leash rules for the areas of the parks where dogs should be leashed, creating unpleasant experiences for me and my husband.

Corr. ID: 4456 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208522 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In addition the damage to the city parks will be enormous. On the day of the tsunami warning (3/11/2011) Stem Grove, as I am sure was the case with other parks as well, was literally overrun with dogs because they were not allowed on the coastlines. If this were a daily occurrence, the damage would become insurmountable without a huge expense and the parks are much more populated with people and children than the beaches are with the exception of the handful of sunny days in San Francisco.

Concern ID:

31557

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Considering existing use in adjacent city parks and the lands still open to dog walking in the GGNRA under the proposed plan, there would not be impacts on city parks and other areas utilized by dog owners in the area.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4700

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 227459 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: [Comment was originally presented at BOS committee hearing 4-11-11 by Frank Dean]

Well, it was not an exhaustive study; I will concede that. But basically we looked at the existing levels of use in city parks by dogs and users, and we looked at what we are proposing ' realizing again that it's not a ban, we're, we're, we're shifting people around within the existing parks that we manage, we're not banning them, to concentrate or focus the use in certain zones and to steer them away from other areas that might be more sensitive. We in the end did not believe that there would be significant impact on, on the adjacent parklands, whether they be city of San Francisco or San Mateo or Marin.

LU3020 - Adjacent Lands: Impacts to other Dog Parks

Concern ID:

29703

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters have stated that the proposed DEIS did not adequately evaluate impacts to other dog parks in the plan. Impacts to the surrounding areas should be considered in the DEIS. Some areas suggested for off-leash dog walking within the document, such as Lake Merced has been closed to dogs for years. Commenters are concerned that the proposed DEIS will cause environmental issues at other dog parks.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 419

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 181602 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It will overload other city parks in SF and Marin as dog owners are pushed out of the GGNRA off-leash area. This concentration of dogs in small spaces will lead to environmental problems and social issues

Corr. ID: 914

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 191325 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crowding SF's dog population in the few small dog parks that exist in the city is outrageous, and would certainly result in more environmental destruction and chaos than the proposal suggests.

Corr. ID: 1267

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 194975 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: What is going to happen to my neighborhood park, Alamo Square, when the amount of land available for off leash recreation within the GGNRA is drastically reduced? No where within the DEIS is this impact even considered. The GGNRA is an urban park and the impact on the surrounding

communities when changing park access regulations must be considered.

Corr. ID: 1803

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191654

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Reducing the amount of area available for off-leash will significantly degrade the park experience for people with dogs. It will increase conflicts. Even more importantly, the DEIS 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. 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 DEIS suggests people with dogs go.

Corr. ID: 3733

Organization: SF DOG, Save McLaren Park

Comment ID: 204573

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The contraction of areas available for off-leash recreation will significantly compromise the park experience for people with dogs, and could lead to an increase in conflict as more and more people are forced into smaller and smaller areas. The impacts of people moving from the GGNRA into city parks is not adequately addressed in the DEIS.

Any alternative must address these impacts on city parks and ways to mitigate them.

Corr. ID: 4356

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209500

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With the multitude of dog households in this area, taking away our off-leash parks would mean pushing hundreds of dogs into already crowded city parks. This increases conflict, aggression, trash, traffic, and all the attendant over-crowding ill effects. I do not believe the GGNRA has studied or documented this potential negative impact.

Corr. ID: 4583

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209991

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: GGNRA/DEIS made no good faith attempt to analyze potential impacts on neighboring parks if recreational dog walkers are displaced from GGNRA sites. The DEIS repeats, "An increase in visitation in nearby parks is not likely..." in many instances where an increase in visitation to nearby parks is assured. Consider, as only one example of many, Alternative C, the Preferred Alternative for Fort Funston. Most of the off-leash area at Fort Funston will disappear under this alternative. The many people who visit this heavily used park will not fit into the small areas remaining. Yet GGNRA doesn't acknowledge they will go elsewhere, and says, "An increase in visitation in nearby parks is not likely." (DEIS p 1530) This allows the unsubstantiated conclusion that the Preferred Alternative will have, "No indirect impacts in adjacent parks."

Concern ID:

29704

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters are concerned that the proposed DEIS will force dog owners to take their dogs to other dog parks that are either unsafe, too small, or too confined for their dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 269 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 180873 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Without exercise, like humans, dogs will not only be mentally challenged but curbing their natural instincts for exercise will make for complicated gatherings at dogs parks already overrun and burdened with human excrement and trash. I am speaking of the two parks (Duboce and Dolores) near my house where it is not safe for my dog to play with other dogs.
Corr. ID: 3192 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 203952 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a Native American, I respect the land of my ancestors, and my family has lived in this part of Northern California for a thousand years. This debate continues to remain a debate between the nature of the areas of concern and what they are meant to serve. Pristine wilderness vs. multi-recreational urban land.

I take my dog to Fort Funston every day for off leash exercise, and there is nowhere else where she and I could renew our spirits than here. She or I could not be confined to a dog park, and I could not bear to see the state of the "dog run" area that the Preferred Alternative suggests after a few months.

This city has grown into an area of dog lovers and that won't change by re-thinking the nature of these areas and pretending they are wilderness lands.

Please penalize those dog owners or walkers who walk their dogs irresponsibly rather than punish all of us by taking away this critical land.

MB1100 - Muir Beach: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29245

***CONCERN
STATEMENT:***

Implementing the preferred alternative at Muir Beach will protect important natural resources. The Big Lagoon, Redwood Creek and the riparian areas, and the species living in these areas are impacted by dogs in these areas, even though dogs are currently restricted.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 666 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181557 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dogs are off leash where they shouldn't be. They are in the Big Lagoon often, Redwood Creek and the riparian zone where they can impact salmonid and frog species recovery. Dogs run after shorebirds, which are disappearing at an alarming rate. Though I have observed all regulations, cleaned up after my dog, (he doesn't chase anything) and kept him leashed in restricted areas, I cannot condone the further permitting of dogs on Muir Beach. It has gotten too impacting. However if dogs continue to be allowed at these beaches, the responsibility lies on Park Service to provide better education and clarity about where and why dogs are restricted.
Corr. ID: 4263 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209140 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I support the preferred Alternative to the Muir Beach portion of the GGNRA Dog Management Plan.
The impact of dogs, especially off leash, to wildlife is real. There have been virtually no shorebirds or other marine birds resting on Muir Beach (in the 16 years in which I have lived in Muir Beach) except very early in the morning before dog walkers arrive (very early on Saturdays, especially). Without dogs on the main beach, there is a possibility of actual nesting of some shore species and those which

could nest in the front lagoon.

Concern ID: 29246

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The preferred alternative should be implemented to protect visitor experience. The abundance of dogs off-leash detracts from the enjoyment of picnicking or being at the beach. Dogs defecating especially affects the ability to enjoy being at Muir Beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1066 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192188 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a Berkeley resident who frequently visits GGNRA sites for hiking outings on weekends. I have been hiking and picnicking at Muir Beach since 1978 and have seen many changes in that area over the decades.

Most disturbing to me is the overabundance of dogs off leash. I no longer feel comfortable picnicking or even sitting on the sand, as I've watched too many dogs urinate and defecate on the beach, with no owner in sight. Even when an owner is responsibly monitoring their dog's behavior, there's not much an owner can do when a dog has a loose bowel movement that cannot be picked up with a plastic baggie and tossed in a garbage can.

In addition, dogs off leash are a danger to toddlers and small children.

Please restrict all off-leash dogs to special, fenced areas within the GGNRA. And please make tiny, gem-like Muir Beach a completely dog-free area.

I support Alternative D of the Draft Dog Management Plan.

Concern ID: 29247

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The preferred alternative will enhance visitor safety. Some visitors are concerned that off-leash dogs pose a safety threat to them and their children, citing examples of dogs exhibiting aggressive and threatening behavior.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3548 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203409 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly prefer that the Marin Headlands Trails of Tennessee Valley, Coastal Trail, Coyote Ridge and Miwok Trails exclude dogs. I also strongly prefer that dogs not be allowed on Muir Beach, and that they be on leash at Stinson Beach and/or the beach is divided into two sections, with one being dogs allowed and one being dogs not allowed. This would need to be clearly posted and enforced to ensure that dogs don't wander to the wrong side and that dog owners understand the rules.

My stance comes as a result of several incidences over the years of dogs approaching us in a threatening way. We have had the experience, on more than one occasion, of off-leash dogs growling and baring their teeth and charging at us and our on-leash dog who was not evoking a challenge. We have children and felt that their safety was in immediate peril. One time on the Miwok Trail, I was terrified, especially since the dog owner was claiming his dogs were nice, even while they growled and charged at us. Many owners like him have claimed their dogs are harmless, even as their dogs displayed behavior to the contrary, and they refused to leash the dogs even though it was supposed to be an on-leash trail.

I feel that the on-leash rule almost never works, since no one is there to enforce it. I cannot go on a relaxing hike if I have to be the one to contend with those who do not respect the rules nor my right to feel secure.

On the main Tennessee Valley trail, where dogs are not allowed at all, I have never

had a problem and have only seen a dog once. It seems obvious that people will not bring dogs if they are not allowed at all and this rule is clearly posted. But if the rules are confusing or if they are more lenient, such as if on-leash is okay, then it seems a majority of people will let their dogs off-leash, and perhaps just carry the leash separately. I have seen this more times than not. 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. It seems the only way to change this would be to not allow dogs in those areas.

MB1200 - Muir Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29248

***CONCERN
STATEMENT:***

The preferred alternative to only allow dogs in the parking lot at Muir Beach would represent a major change from the historic use of this area. Dogs have been allowed on Muir Beach for many years and this use should continue. In addition, the preferred alternative is not logical. Commenters don't understand why visitors would bring their dogs to Muir Beach only to be allowed to walk on-leash in the parking lot. The alternative beach, Little Beach that the park recommends for dog walking is not accessible without crossing the main beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 17

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181447 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a resident of Muir Beach, the proposed ban on dogs at the beach is extremely upsetting to myself and most of the community. Dogs have been permitted at Muir Beach since the formation of the GGNRA (with the exception of a brief period that was soon overturned), so this is a distinct departure via this proposed rule.

Corr. ID: 315

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181066 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please reconsider the plan for Muir Beach. It makes no sense to allow dogs on-leash in the parking lot, then ban them from the beach. Why would I take my dog to Muir Beach to walk him around the parking lot on-leash? I take my dog to Muir Beach so he can run and play ball, he's a lab retriever. A dog playing on the beach should be allowed off-leash and under voice control like mine is. If you want to have a leash law in the parking lot, or on the trail to the beach, or anywhere near the fresh water marsh-like area, I can see that, but banning dogs from the beach for off-leash makes no sense. Your own report shows little to no impact on the area one way or the other. Please stop trying to regulate what does not need regulating.

Corr. ID: 1340

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195147 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative D is Not Viable

The preferred plan states that "off-leash dog walking can occur at a small beach area on county property adjacent to the NPS beach". The area they refer to is called "Little Beach" and it is not accessible without crossing the main beach or driving along neighborhood private roads. Squeezing people over to that beach for use with their dogs is not a reasonable alternative.

Corr. ID: 2163

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200559 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing my express my concern and opinion about the ban of dogs on Muir Beach and the coastal trail, because this is the area I am familiar with and will impact my daily life. I have grown up in Muir Beach since 1963 and I live there now. Muir beach has historically always been a "dog friendly"

area and should remain that way. The current dog management rules from the GGNRA have been and are working fine

Corr. ID: 3152

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203793

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The data presented in the Draft Plan does not support Alternative D being designated as the Preferred Alternative. The data presented in the Draft Plan only supports Alternative Plan A, the No Action alternative. The data, itself, however, is deeply flawed as is the methodology used in the Draft Plan as regarding Muir Beach. Dogs have been allowed off-leash at Muir Beach for more than 150 years. The Draft Plan does not provide any compelling reason why the National Park Service (NPS) should interfere with this long-standing right of the people of Marin County to let their dogs enjoy the beach. If the Park Service has to take action at Muir Beach, just restrict dogs to being on leash in the parking lot and the boardwalk leading to the beach. Restrict dogs from being in Redwood Creek, and if necessary, build better fences around the lagoon and the dune. And if there times of the year when the presence of dogs threatens the breeding habitat of migrating birds, then just prohibit the presence of dogs during that limited period. You provide no data showing that any significant or permanent damage to the ecosystem has occurred after more than 150 years of dogs running free and no data showing an acceleration of damage in recent years. If the fencing is inadequate to discourage dogs then just fix the fencing. There is no data supporting the conclusion that nutrient addition from dog waste during the last 150 years at Muir Beach has had a "long-term cumulative moderate adverse impact on the soil." If the presence of dogs has not destroyed or damaged any "archeological resources" at Muir Beach in the last 150 years, the desire to protect archeological resources does not justify restricting dogs at Muir Beach. Heal the Bay's Summer Beach Report Card 2010 gives North, Central and South Muir Beaches an A+ for water quality for both dry and wet times of the year. There is no evidence that dogs have permanently damaged the riparian vegetation in the last 150 years. But there is no evidence that this is a problem at Muir Beach. Dogs run free at Muir Beach; Redwood Creek has amphibians and reptiles. If there is a problem, then ban dogs from Redwood Creek, not the beach. What has the affect been on the sea mammal population? Let me save you the trouble of doing the research—there has been no impact. There is no documentation that dogs have either directly or indirectly affected the coho salmon in Redwood Creek.

Concern ID:

29249

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Dogs should continue to be allowed at Muir Beach to ensure the safety of their owners when exercising. Women and children visitors especially feel safer walking alone when they have their dog(s) with them.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2192

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200587

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Of key importance is that our daughter routinely exercises our dog in the area bordering our home in Mill Valley, the Marin Headlands, and Muir Beach. This has been an incredible bonding experience for the two of them and a wonderful way for my daughter to safely hike on her own or with her other learning disabled friends. If the dog were not permitted to go with them, they would not be allowed to go for safety reasons. Getting learning disabled kids to feel motivated to venture into the world, let alone exercise independently, is a huge task which would be impossible without dog access to the GGNRA in our area.

Concern ID:

29250

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Dogs and people should be able to enjoy Muir Beach. Walking your dog or allowing your dog to run off-leash at Muir Beach provides enjoyment to people and

dogs. Even visitors who don't have dogs enjoy seeing dogs play on the beach and thus benefit from the experience. Commenters also stated that they have seen children damage some of the natural resources in the area.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 18

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181448

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs on Muir Beach are a wonderful thing. Having the beach available as an area where off-lease dogs, under their owners control is permissible should be preserved. Signage encouraging this would be appropriate as well as additional pet waste collection bag dispensers.

Corr. ID: 49

Organization: resident of California/ member of Sierra Club

Comment ID: 181782

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Muir Beach has always been a wonderful place to walk and to play with my dogs. Owners are responsible for their dogs behavior, but the opportunity to run the shore, play catch and tease should NOT be taken away.

Corr. ID: 264

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180854

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On a nice weekend most of the playing in the creek mouth is by children who often build dams (mostly boys) across the endangered salmon habitat.

Corr. ID: 881

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190045

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am individual who is not a dog owner. However I enjoy the dogs on the beach. I think it would be a shame to keep dogs off of Muir Beach.

Concern ID:

31818

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The suggestion of Little Beach as an alternative to Muir Beach for those with dogs is not feasible. The road is not well equipped to handle traffic and parking, the beach is not easily accessible, with the main access coming from Muir Beach, which would be off-limits to dogs. The trail to the beach is rocky, and difficult to use, especially at high tide. Little Beach lacks the necessary facilities for visitors. Commenters mentioned that Little Beach is a nude beach, and they did not feel comfortable taking their children there. In addition the location of Little Beach is not identified on Map 26 and 27, Adjacent Dog Use Areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 264

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180851

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: From what I read in your EIS you are suggesting that people and their dogs go to Little Beach! This is ludicrous. The road to and from there (sunset way) is not equipped to handle any more traffic. It is basically a fire road and needs to remain that way. There is no parking and what little there is on the roadside is usually residential parking. There are no facilities at Little Beach and during the winter months the beach is pretty much unusable as the sand washes out and it becomes just another bit of rocky coastline.

Corr. ID: 284

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180974

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Little Beach is not accessible without crossing the main beach or driving along neighborhood private streets. Most of the time, the rocks are impassible because of surf and tides. There is NO PUBLIC PARKING WHATSOEVER on Sunset Way or Pacific Way. Both roads are private, with no shoulder parking and all spaces belong to homeowners. All lanes are fire lanes. Extra and illegally parked cars would create a hazard for the surrounding community in terms of blocking access to emergency vehicles.

Corr. ID: 1048

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192128 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Preferred Alternative document, in the section on Muir Beach, says "Off-leash dog walking can occur at a small beach area on county property adjacent to the NPS beach," however, that area does not seem to be identified on Map 5 Muir Beach. Looking at that map, I have to assume it's the southern-most end of the beach, the area outside of the green boundary line. If that is the area, how is it to be accessible? The only allowable way out of the parking lot (with a dog) as shown on the map is the Pacific Way Trail, which is "to be built." The map doesn't show the path a dog-walker would have to take via the Pacific Way Trail to reach the south end of the beach, but it appears it could be several miles, which is hardly a practical option, especially for the elderly or handicapped. So what is the proposed access method for this beach area with a dog? Boat? Helicopter?

I've looked at Maps 26 27 Adjacent Dog Use Areas but I don't see the adjacent county property identified on those maps either. Please let me know if I have missed something. I look forward to clarification on this.

Corr. ID: 4257 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209178 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I also wanted to add that I read in the DEIS that a part of Muir Beach known as Little Beach would remain dog friendly. This alternative would not work for us. My children at 7 and 10 and we do not go to Little Beach on nice days because it's a nude beach and we've encountered too many inappropriate things going on there. PLUS to expect that non-Muir Beach residents take their dogs to Little Beach would not work. As the website KeepMuirBeachDogFriendly.com states: Little Beach" is not accessible without crossing the main beach or driving along neighborhood private roads. Most of the time, the rocks are impassible because of surf and tides. The "social trail" from Pacific Way to the north end of Big Beach is a steep, hazardous, rocky pathway, with no handrails. There is no public parking on Sunset Way or Pacific Way. All spaces are on private property. All lanes are fire lanes. Extra and illegally parked cars would create a hazard for the surrounding community in terms of blocking access to emergency vehicles. For those who would arrive on foot via the road, there are no amenities or services for Little Beach. No trash cans. No toilets. In addition, Little Beach oftentimes has no beach at all during the winter or at high tide. Squeezing people over to that beach for use with their dogs is not a reasonable alternative. Formally stating and implementing such a plan would require appropriate impact studies and input from the surrounding community.

MB1300 - Muir Beach: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29251

CONCERN STATEMENT: Continue to allow dogs off-leash and select alternative A as the preferred alternative.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 47 **Organization:** Muir Beach Community Service District

Comment ID: 181779 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support continuing the access off leach under voice control policy for dogs on Muir Beach.Many people use Muir beach for recreation specifically because of the access under voice control policy.

Corr. ID: 181 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182293 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding the plans for Muir Beach, My preferred alternative is Alternative A, which would require dogs to be on leash adjacent to

the environmentally sensitive areas, but would leave the beach available for voice control.

Corr. ID: 201 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180611 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Muir Beach: I prefer Alternative A. I have been using this beach for years to recreate with my dog and I see no problem with the current practice of voice control on the beach.

Corr. ID: 1759 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191494 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: am writing simply to share my view that Muir Beach should remain open to dog owners and their pets. I have been walking my two dogs there for over 10 years and I have never had any issues with wildlife or with other persons at this beach. Indeed, most beach goers seem to relish the presence of joyful dogs.

I am also confused with how these rules interface with retrievers being in the water at Muir Beach. Would this be off limits, too?

It seems such a shame to limit park use and exclude this happy & healthy form of exercise which has been permitted for decades

Corr. ID: 1827 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191937 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly urge you to continue to use education rather than segregation. I am a birdwatcher and a naturalist and appreciate the work that has been done on the lagoon. I love to see the otters and look forward to a time when the salmon are breeding. I do not feel that banning dogs from the entire beach is necessary or warranted. Post more signs regarding the restoration of Redwood Creek and its sensitive habitat clearly stating the rules. There are usually more children than dogs playing in Redwood Creek. I support Map 5A which continues off leash beach access for dogs and Map 7A which keeps the Coastal Fire Rd and the Trail at Muir Beach open for dogs.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

29253

Commenters preferred alternative B as it allows dogs on the beach but protects the sensitive resources since the dogs would be on-leash.

Corr. ID: 466 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181750 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding Muir Beach: Against Preferred Alternative D

The plan to remove all dog access to Muir Beach is not fair to those of us responsible pet owners who have enjoyed taking our dogs there for years. At the very least, alternatives B, C, or E should be implemented if the current usage has been determined to be unacceptable to the environment.

I have no issues with keeping my dog on a leash if it is necessary, but telling me I can't bring my dog is unfair

Corr. ID: 943 **Organization:** Muir Beach resident

Comment ID: 191493 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I don't agree with closing Muir Beach to dogs altogether. I actually wouldn't object to allowing dogs on-leash if it is a viable alternative to banning dogs altogether. Allowing dogs on leash would mitigate many of the safety and habitat concerns that seem to be the main objections to allowing dogs in areas that are both wildlife habitat and public recreation.

Corr. ID: 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates
Comment ID: 209119 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: MUIR BEACH. Alternative B, in which dogs would be on leash, should be implemented for this area to protect sensitive habitat (tidal lagoon, dunes, beach, and Redwood Creek) and associated wildlife from disturbance by dogs.

Corr. ID: 4541 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209718 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I recognize the importance of the frog habitat and nesting area for birds and the future Salmon and possibly steel head trout areas near the wetland adjacent to Muir Beach. Given these sensitive areas I recommend that dogs be restricted to on leash only at Muir Beach. I recognize that this is a major change for the use at Muir Beach but the change has been taking place for years. Muir Beach is transforming to a wonderful Natural Gem and we must respect the sensitive nature of it. I do not think it is appropriate for dogs to run off leash at Muir beach because they will disrupt the shorebird population and frog population that I suspect will return.

Concern ID: 29254

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters preferred alternative E as it protects the sensitive resources and still allows dogs off-leash in a ROLA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 438 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181671 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I understand the reasons behind the preferred alternatives, but dogs - and their owners - have the same rights to recreate in public areas too. I was told by a park ranger that dogs were going to be banned from Muir beach because of environmental concerns, especially for the creek restoration.

A more reasonable solution would be to let the dogs be off leash on the southern part of the beach, and signage could be placed along the stream that specifically bans dogs from that area.

Corr. ID: 1715 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191159 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: (3) Muir beach should protect the lagoon but provide ROLA areas. Alt 5-E is more appropriate.

MB1400 - Muir Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29252

CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA - Allow ROLAs at Muir Beach. Some suggested areas for ROLAs include the southern portion of Muir Beach, the far northern portion of Muir Beach (near the nude beach), with the area between for on-leash dog walking. Another suggestion included a ¾ mile loop from the parking lot around the Middle Green Gulch trail back to Pacific Way, the Pacific Way Trail and the parking lot.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 417 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181584 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Muir Beach (proposed Alternative D): Current proposal prohibits dogs from Muir Beach, in interest of the lagoon. Instead, I propose off-leash dog walking on the southern end of the beach, nearest the cliffs (opposite end from the lagoon) and in the area (currently popular with nude sunbathers) below the houses at the far northern end. On leash only on the rest of the beach, and no dogs in the lagoon.

Corr. ID: 2920 **Organization:** Save Our Seashore
Comment ID: 203369 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation
Representative Quote: COMMENTS ON TWO SPECIFIC MARIN AREAS

Save Our Seashore generally supports GGNRA's Preferred Alternatives in Marin County, but we believe that dog walking opportunities could be better balanced by being less limited at Muir Beach and being more limited at Rodeo yet retaining off-leash opportunities at both areas.

The Muir Beach Preferred Alternative totally eliminates the former off-leash zone and replaces it with an on-leash Pacific Way trail that ends at the parking lot. We suggest instead that Preferred Alternative include the currently-signed NPS on-leash trail that completes a 3/4 mile loop from the parking lot around the Middle Green Gulch trail back to Pacific Way, the Pacific Way Trail and the parking lot. This loop runs on Green Gulch land that by informal agreement with NPS has long allowed emergency vehicles, bikes and dogs, including off-leash. However, we believe this loop was left off the "existing conditions" (Alternative A) because at the time the DEIS was developed, GGNRA had not yet consummated its easement with Green Gulch. Now that the easement is formal, the loop should be shown both as existing and in our opinion as the Preferred Alternative. Including the fire road portions of the loop as a ROLA would be consistent with Marin County Open Space rules that allow off-leash use of Fire Roads and would create a largely off-leash loop that would partially compensate dog walkers for the removal of the public beach as an off-leash area (residents still have "Little Beach" as an option). In our opinion, the topography of the road and the existing farm fences at Green Gulch provide adequate "fencing" and visual notice of an off-leash area.

Concern ID:
CONCERN
STATEMENT:

29255
Signage and Education - Additional signage clearly stating Muir Beach dog walking regulations and consequences need to be installed preferably at the footbridge to the beach. Signs educating visitors on restoration activities would reduce visitors within the lagoon and creek.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 840 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209620 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I do understand the need to keep unleashed dogs out of restored areas, and I do practice precaution when I walk my dog off-leash at Muir Beach. So, I do feel that I can continue to abide by the policies already in place at this location. I would not visit the Beach if I could not allow my dog off-leash there. It is the main reason I visit and support this area.

All that said, I am worried that some dog owners do not diligently abide by Muir Beach policies, mainly because not enough clear, no-nonsense, uncompromising signage is posted. Added or better signage, with posted consequences for non-adherence, I feel would be enough to re-train the public in keeping their dogs out of restored areas, if this in fact is a problem.

Corr. ID: 2120 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193396 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Clear signage as to prohibited areas at Muir Beach, Redwood Creek and the Lagoon. A ticket or two to dog owners and families playing, swimming, and damming the creek!

Corr. ID: 4543 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209795 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In response to the NPS Dog Management Preferred Plan, we propose the following alternative plan:

- A dog litter bag dispenser and waste receptacle placed at the footbridge entrance to the area. Like many dog-friendly parks throughout the Bay Area, this is an effective way to encourage dog owners to pick up after their pets.
- Increased signage and education efforts provided by NPS so that all visitors to these areas are aware of current rules and regulations

Specifically:

- a large sign at the footbridge entry to the beach which clearly defines beach rules for all visitors.
- signs placed at the lagoon and creek areas which forbid swimming, trampling on vegetation or disturbing wildlife in these areas

Concern ID:

29257

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

On-Leash - Dogs should be kept on-leash in areas near sensitive resources to protect the resources. Dogs on leash on the beach would also mitigate for some of the safety concerns. Dogs should also be kept on-leash on the boardwalk leading to the beach and within the parking lot.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1540

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190720

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Re: Muir Beach & Dogs

Why not require dogs on leash in sensitive areas

ex: keep away from creek at north end during salmon spawning and away from the sensitive areas for birds. Consider example of McClures Beach where birds' areas protected during nesting season.

Corr. ID: 3152

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 226795

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If the Park Service has to take action at Muir Beach, just restrict dogs to being on leash in the parking lot and the boardwalk leading to the beach.

Concern ID:

30365

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Time Restrictions - Create time intervals that would allow ROLAs on the beach. Dogs could be restricted in early morning or on the weekends. Another suggestion included alternating days that ROLAs would be allowed. In addition, limit dog walking during breeding seasons of salmon and migrating birds.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1632

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 223785

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is my understanding that Redwood Creek, which empties into Muir Beach, provides spawning access to salmon and steelhead in winter months. If it is concluded that dogs interfere with this access, ban dogs entirely for the spawning months and open the beach to dogs the rest of the year. This all-or-nothing plan would be easy to enforce and would be easily understood by dog owners.

Corr. ID: 2011

Organization: Ocean Riders of Marin

Comment ID: 219036

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Possible limitations such as weekend exclusion or mornings only (no dogs); or alternate days for families who have children who fear dogs. If dog owners are given the opportunity to monitor and educate each other to keep the privilege of dogs on the beach some of the Park Service concerns might be addressed. If it doesn't work, then the natural consequences would be to move to the next step. At least you've given them an opportunity.

Corr. ID: 2126

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193411 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: MuBe- Off leash ROLA hours-
example: Before 11:00 AM and/or weekends.

Concern ID: 30367

CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA Size - The ROLA proposed in alternative E is too small and should be increased in size to decrease the risk of conflicts between dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 133 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 182231 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed ROLA at Muir Beach is far too limited in size - dogs tend to have issues with each other in more confined spaces. The size of the beach prevents too many dogs from being in one place. I can see a problem with dogs being off leash on the busiest of weekend days, when space is at a premium

Concern ID: 30369

CONCERN STATEMENT: Fencing - A fenced area for off-leash dog walking should be provided on Muir Beach. A barrier should also be located along the sand dunes from the bridge to the creek outlet. Providing fencing will protect the natural resources at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1979 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 193154 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Muir Beach a long time open ocean area - BUT so much time, energy + planning has gone into lagoon restoration & visitors are often folks who - not like most Marin residents - let dogs run free + they chase + destroy ground bird species.

Have a fenced beach area so dogs may run free. Plan a budget for "policing of the very few who abuse all areas. It makes sense to have closures during Breeding season - nests disruption a real problem. But you will need education about ecosystem - fines not as effective as "perhaps" volunteer guardians or GGNRA personnel.

Corr. ID: 2011 **Organization:** Ocean Riders of Marin

Comment ID: 200522 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Muir Beach: I would like to see the following: Dogs on leash in parking lot until they get to the open beach; barrier from bridge to the creek outlet along the sand dune protection area on beach side of the creek; doggy disposal baggies at the boardwalk crossing in parking lot; No dogs in creek (as is now the law);

Corr. ID: 3152 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 226797 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And if there times of the year when the presence of dogs threatens the breeding habitat of migrating birds, then just prohibit the presence of dogs during that limited period. The East Bay Regional Park Service can successfully do this.

Corr. ID: 3152 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 226796 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Restrict dogs from being in Redwood Creek, and if necessary, build better fences around the lagoon and the dune. The purpose of such fences would not be to ensure no dog ever enters an area where it does not belong; the purpose would be to ensure there are not so many dogs in the area as to cause irreparable harm.

MH1100 - Marin Headlands: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29224

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support the restrictions to dogs under the preferred alternative since it would reduce visitor use conflicts (i.e., running, wildlife photography), protect wildlife and their habitat, and enforce the prohibition of dogs within Tennessee Valley.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2117

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193386

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a runner the Marin Headlands preferred alternative is fine.

Corr. ID: 2172

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200596

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am not clear about Tenn. Valley and its tributary trails to the north (e.g. Foxx). Per Map 7, none of these permit dogs. If that is the case, I support this! Tenn Valley has become an off-leash dog walk, with signs prohibiting routinely ignored. Dogs run over the trail shoulders and on the beach, chasing birds. Let me urge a separate map for Tenn Valley to make this absolutely clear. Tenn Valley is popular with visitors from afar (judging from license plates and car stickers); maybe less so for local residents?; I'm speculating a lot of dogs in Tenn Valley come with occasional visitors who don't think rules apply to them.

Corr. ID: 4265

Organization: Kellner and Associates

Comment ID: 209120

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: MARIN HEADLANDS TRAILS. Alternative C appears to protect wildlife by removing dogs from some trails and allowing leashed dogs on other trails.

Some areas of the Marin Headlands should be protected from dogs because of the value of the Marin Headlands to bobcats. In addition, the habitat of the endangered Mission blue butterfly should be protected by excluding dogs or restricting access to dogs on leashes.

MH1200 - Marin Headlands: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID:

29225

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The Preferred Alternative creates safety issues by restricting dogs from some of the trails; some commenters do not feel safe while hiking without their dog.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 973

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191668

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Coastal Trail:

I fail to understand how a dog on leash causes any problem. There are so few places someone can hike with a dog. Why remove yet another? I'm a woman and I often hike alone with my dog. I don't hike on any trails without my dog because it's so isolated in many places that I don't feel safe. My dog is my protection. You have removed most of the Headlands from me. Please don't take one of the last trails left to me.

Concern ID:

29226

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The Preferred Alternative interferes with the visitor experience at the Marin Headlands. It prevents visitors with dogs from views of the ocean and the San Francisco Bridge. Commenters also believe that it reduces the amount of trails currently available to hikers with dogs and does not allow for a long loop experience. The preferred alternative does not accommodate visitors without cars. In addition, the preferred alternative does not allow off-leash dog walking, a concern to visitors who prefer to walk their dogs off leash.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 990

Organization: My own organization

Comment ID: 191706

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Don't deplete the few trails that you already have open to us with dogs. We only visit the Marin Headlands because there are trails available to dogs, and removing the trails close to the water means that we will be stuck on trails with no view of the ocean and the SF Golden Gate Bridge. HOW ABOUT YOU OPEN UP EVEN MORE TRAILS TO THE DOGS!!!!

Corr. ID: 992 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191708 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Marin Headlands is one of those great parks that allows dogs and it would be a shame if the limited amount of trails that dogs are allowed on is further reduced. Owning a dog means that when I go hiking, my dog comes with me. The only reason that I visit Marin Headlands is because it allows dogs. I will not return to the headlands in the future if trail access for dogs is diminished.

Corr. ID: 1949 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192691 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The opportunity to go on the Coastal Trail give me the opportunity to practice commands, meet other responsible dog owners, and allow my dog to run (under voice control). Not having a car, I cannot drive my dog to a dog park that would be large enough to allow him some freedom and not be confronted by too many dogs in one small fenced-in area. Keep the Coastal Trail ROLA, please!

Corr. ID: 2124 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193405 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Re: Marin Headlands. For years we have walked our dogs on leash up wolf ridge to hill 88. We love to share these beautiful views and spaces w/our dogs. Please don't limit us to the lower reaches of the headlands. It seems that existing trails are able to accomodate dogs w/o a negative impact on the flora and fauna.

Concern ID: 29227

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree that the Miwok trail should be closed to dogs since they believe it is an underused trail.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 941 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191458 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Another example -- the Miwok trail in the Marin Headlines. But why forbid all dog access on this impressive and underused trail? I have walked the length of that trail and seen hardly one other trail user. What is forbidding on-leash dogs achieving here? It simply makes no sense.

Concern ID: 29228

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters oppose the preferred alternative because they do not believe that on-leash dog walking would negatively impact wildlife and wildlife habitat. Commenters believe that the additional limits on trail access is not based on or supported by sound science or any long-term monitoring of the sites.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1639 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200219 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As someone who takes great pleasure in hiking the Marin Headlands Trails with my dog (a dog who is voice-control trained), I do not understand in what way on-leash walking on the Coastal Trail would negatively impact habitat.

Corr. ID: 4533 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209695 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I also strongly disagree with other limitations that would be placed on dog access at Crissy Field and Rodeo Beach in particular. The

additional limits on access in the grassy area, East Beach, West Beach and the paths to the Central Beach at Crissy Field, as well as in the Marin Headlands, especially along Wolf Ridge, are untenable and don't appear to be based on or supported by sound science or any long-term monitoring of the sites. How is it that walking a dog on leash along Wolf Ridge has a more negative impact than people walking along the trail, assuming regulations (such as picking up after a pet and not harassing wildlife) are followed? The Plan/DEIS needs to be revised to include real science-based information taken from long-term monitoring of the sites that is conclusive regarding negative impacts before restrictions on recreation with dogs are suggested or imposed. In addition, the limitations placed on the grassy area of Crissy Field in connection with events needs should not be open ended. As written, the GGNRA could potentially always have events planned in the area and the grassy field can, effectively, always be off limits to people with dogs. There should be limits placed on the number and frequency of the events if they are to cause limits on access with dogs.

MH1300 - Marin Headlands: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29229

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support alternative A for the preferred alternative for the Marin Headlands. It is the only alternative that allows the visitor to have a long loop trail experience with their dog. The existing off-leash dog walking areas should continue to be available to dogs and their responsible owners. The commenters believe that the environmental impacts of dogs to protected butterflies is not evidence-based; therefore there is no reason to change the trail options at the Marin Headlands.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3827

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 209294

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would also strongly suggest incrementally less restriction on dogs on Marin headlands trails. The potential environmental damage to the environment of leashed dogs on these trails to protected butterflies is not evidence-based and is likely completely unrealistic. As such, I strongly suggest adopting alternative A or E at this site as well.

Concern ID: 29230

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support alternative D because it provides the most protection of natural resources and a high level of visitor safety.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3912

Organization: Alto Bowl Horseowners Association

Comment ID: 205586

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: We believe it's very reasonable that "resource protection" and "visitor safety" should have highest priority in any plan, yet the NPS preferred alternatives for all Marin sites except Muir Beach appear to compromise those obligations in order to enable "multiple use" for the purpose of dog walking. We strongly suggest that alternative "D" is the most appropriate alternative for all Marin sites, providing strong protection of natural resources and a high level of visitor safety.

MH1400 - Marin Headlands: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29231

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Enforcement - NPS should continue to allow off-leash dog walking; however, if an owner is not responsible in adhering to the rules then they should be ticketed and fined at a high monetary penalty.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 628

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 181311 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My suggestion for Rodeo Beach and the Marin Headlands (it is where I frequent and am most familiar) is to continue to allow dogs to be off lease and under voice control. However, if an owner is not responsible in adhering to the concerns/rules of the Park, then they should be ticketed and fined at a high monetary penalty to serve as a deterrent.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

29232

[ROLA - NPS should allow off-leash dog walking on the Coastal Trail and on-leash dog walking on the other trails. The preference is to keep a long loop trail open to off-leash dog walking and to create as many loops as possible with fewer dead-end trails.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 85

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181892 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Marin Headlands / Rodeo Beach

The preferred alternative massively reduces the trail available for hikers with a dog. We often complete the loop up the coastal trail to Hill 88 and then down Wolf Ridge / Miwok to return to Rodeo Beach. The trails are rarely crowded and a well behaved dog has no more impact than a person. The Hill 88 loop should be kept open to off-leash dogs. The preferred alternative for Rodeo Beach is acceptable.

Corr. ID: 417

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181585 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Marin Headlands (proposed Alternative C): The current GGNRA proposal bans dogs from the Coastal Trail, which is the only trail (away from the parking lot/traffic) that currently allows dogs. Instead, dogs should be allowed off-leash on the Coastal Trail, on leash on the other mentioned trails, and off leash on Rodeo Beach. It does not seem logical that the Coastal Trail should remain a bike trail (nebulous under state traffic laws, more detrimental to sensitive habitat than dogs) but disallow dogs.

Corr. ID: 3934

Organization: 3rd Supervisorial District of the County of Marin

Comment ID: 205853 **Organization Type:** County Government

Representative Quote: Marin Headlands: Again, we would like to suggest that as many loops be created as possible with fewer dead-end trails. It would certainly be acceptable to have both off-leash and on-leash areas, but it seems that dogs on leash should be allowed on sidewalks and roads. For instance, the intersection of the Rodeo Valley Trail could be connected at McCullough to the Coastal Trail, which would provide a great deal of variety and options for trail choice

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

30389

[On-Leash - Commenters suggested opening other trails to on-leash dog walking such as Wolf Ridge Trail, Coastal Trail, Coyote Ridge Trail, and Miwok Fire Road.](#)

Corr. ID: 1340

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195151 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The preferred alternative would eliminate dog access to the Coastal Fire Road and Trail adjacent to Muir Beach.

As it stands, these are the only remaining trails from Muir Beach that are open to dogs. For women who hike alone, this new rule presents a serious safety concern.

In addition, we believe that there should be a legal way for a person to walk between Muir Beach and the nearest community, Mill Valley. Currently, there is no continuous trail that allows this access with a dog. Adding a dog-friendly access of the Coyote Ridge Trail to

Miwok Fire Road would allow hikers with dogs to cross from Muir Beach into Mill Valley.

Corr. ID: 1820

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191914

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to you regarding the Dog Management Draft Plan/DEIS for Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I am requesting that you consider revising your recommendations to continue to allow on-leash dogs on the following Marin Headlands Trails: Coastal Trail (Hill 88 to Muir Beach) and (Golden Gate Bridge to Hill 88, including Lagoon Trail), Coastal, Wolf Ridge, Miwok Loop, South Rodeo Beach Trail, North Miwok Trail (from Tennessee Valley to Highway 1) and County View Trail.

I walk on those trails frequently with my dog and those hikes are an integral part of my life. Those trails are generally not crowded and there is a good mix of people with dogs and people walking without dogs. I have never encountered any problems between people and dogs, nor have I seen dogs chasing birds or disrupting the environment

Concern ID:

31553

CONCERN STATEMENT:

All trails currently available to dogs should be provided as on-leash trails, as there has been damage to resources at the site. The Coastal trail to Miwok trail and the Julian Road extension east should also be added as on-leash areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4687

Organization: County of Marin Dept. of Parks and Open Space

Comment ID: 227456

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: New restrictions in the Marin Headlands surely will result in significant impacts of displacement to county parks. The Headlands trails that are currently open to off leash use (as shown in alternative A) constitute the quintessential Marin County trails experience. These trails are beloved by all, including those who recreate with their dogs. The county acknowledges that current impacts to resources warrant management changes. If the same trails depicted as off leash in alternative A were made leash-required, these impacts could be minor. The draft EIS analysis of impacts to the Marin Headlands trails does not conclusively indicate closure of these trails to dogs. It does support requiring leashes. The county wonders if the feasibility of achieving compliance with a leash rule dictated the decision to choose closure of the loop of the Coastal Trail to Wolf Trail to Miwok Trail. We urge GGNRA to give further consideration to adding this loop and the Julian Road (Coastal Trail) extension east to the leash-required inventory. Perhaps additional outreach and rigor of enforcement could help to underscore the importance of reducing resource impacts in this iconic area.

MP1100 - Mori Point: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID:

29269

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters supported the preferred alternative. They felt the preferred alternative includes areas and trails for both visitors who enjoy dogs and those who are seeking a no-dog experience. In addition, the preferred alternative allows for adequate protection of sensitive natural resources.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4265

Organization: Kellner and Associates

Comment ID: 209128

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: MORI POINT. Dogs should be restricted to leashes on the Coastal Trail, Old Mori Point Road, and beach within GGNRA boundary to protect sensitive native grassland habitat and habitat of the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake.

Corr. ID: 4354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209531 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: MORI POINT

On a Sunday morning with changeable weather there were fewer people on Mori Point than I have seen on previous weekday and Saturday visits. I saw the great progress in native plant restoration and trails since my most recent visit last fall. Mori Point is a poster child for the encouragement of park stakeholders through community activism. Many of the plantings on Old Mori Road are obviously just taking hold.

There is some fencing but many of those plantings and the natural areas behind them as well as the ponds cannot be well protected from off-leash dogs.

When I paid a subsequent visit on a sunny Sunday afternoon, the situation was about the same except that there were more people and dogs. In general, the people with dogs paid attention to the behavior of their animals. I saw only small incursions into habitat. But I think dogs have to be leashed along Old Mori Road.

About half the dogs I saw were on leash. It is evident why they should be on leash on the Old Mori Road and the Coastal Trail and why they particularly should not be allowed on the Headlands Trail which is already beaten down just by human visitors. In the Preferred Alternative three trail segments have no dogs which should provide a good alternative experience for those who do not wish to encounter them.

I endorse the Preferred Alternative.

MP1200 - Mori Point: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29273

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The restriction of dogs to fewer trails at Mori Point is confusing, and the removal of leashed dogs from certain trails did not seem justified. Restricting dog walking would impact property values in Fairway Park.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 591 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182142 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fairway Park, by my most recent estimate, includes more than 40 dog owners many of whom frequently use Mori Point to walk their dogs. Unfortunately, I now feel my use of this space is threatened by a preferred policy which restricts on leash dogs to 2 trails passing through the space only. This policy is very confusing based on the environmental reviews on your website which state little to no impact on habitat by leashed dogs. Further confusing this preferred policy is the fact that trails which allow dogs on leash are all within 100-200 feet of trails which prohibit dogs even though they share the same watersheds and natural features.

Corr. ID: 941 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191455 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: For example, consider the Bluff Trail at Mori Point. This trail is heavily disturbed by generations of human impact. It is littered with concrete debris from various military installations, many covered with graffiti. Invasive species of ground cover are rife. The trail is short and leads directly away from park property. The trail is extensively used by current dog walkers as a way to complete an easy loop back into Pacifica property. No alternative exists for this loop. There

are simply no environmental grounds for excluding dogs from this trail. However it appears that since the "Preferred Alternative" is simply to exclude all dogs wherever possible then with a stroke of a pen all dogs will be excluded. Why? That is entirely against the mandate of the Park Service. Have the authors of the report even visited the site? I would happily show them the widespread, long term, and ongoing human (not canine!) disturbance to the site if they actually want some hard facts to add into the report. But instead the authors just seem to follow the unbalanced agenda of canine restrictions at any costs.

Corr. ID: 1724 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191176 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To restrict dogs from certain trails in Mori Point would (in my opinion) negatively impact the property values in Fairway Park.

Corr. ID: 1787 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200269 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My comments will be specifically in regards to the Mori Point. Imagine my shock, when I learned that I might be barred from walking my dog down Polliwog Path, a trail that backs up to a row of homes, many with dogs. How could my dog on a leash be a greater threat to the area than that of a dog inside a fence, just inches away? Truthfully, I feel that my dog poses less danger. I know where she is at all times on the trail. The dogs in the backyards might break, dig under or jump their fences, and be loose for hours while their owners are at work.

I was also dismayed to read that certain other trails and areas at Mori Point could be designated dog-free. I began to think of how it could negatively impact the value of my property! Every time a home in our neighborhood comes up for sale, the description mentions the nearness of the GGNRA. Of course, that is a GGNRA without dog restriction.

I know that one goal of the Dog Plan is to reduce confusion. It is my opinion that allowing dogs on some parts of Mori Point, but not others, will only add to the confusion.

Concern ID: 29275

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The preferred alternative would make access for disabled visitors more difficult, and would crowd visitors to Mori Point into fewer trails, which may end in conflicts between users. Additionally, visitors who were seeking a more rugged experience would not be accommodated with the loss of trails under the preferred alternative.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1276 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194996 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Cutting off Mori Point and the area by the waster water treatment is unacceptable. This is a lovely area where we take him several times a week. Happy dogs are exercised ones. They are less barky and are well socialized. Dogs are meant to run! If we limit where we can take our dogs(EVEN MORE!) then we will have more problems b/c those areas will become so crowded that there will be more incidents of aggression.

Corr. ID: 1702 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191120 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Mori Point- keep Plan A - all trails open to leashed dogs. Proposed plan forces dogs onto trails most used by elderly + small children (low, flat) - and denies access to longer, more rugged trails needed for dog exercise.

Corr. ID: 3051 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201211 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The new rulings by the GGNRA regarding limiting friendly dogs and their responsible owners is outrageous and without merit... It is too restrictive! I speak for everyone, esp. disabled seniors...who are very limited as to where they can access recreation areas and get exercise.

Very specifically....do not take away The Mori Point walk-way from our Pacifica Pier, and the off-leash areas of Fort Funston and The Great Highway in S.F. These are only truly accessible for the handicapped, who also need freedom, recreation rights and access without parking hassels and increased stress.

Corr. ID: 3726 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202345 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan alternatives that further restrict or ban dogs in open spaces.

1) Mori Point in Pacifica. The work GGNRA has been doing in this park has been fabulous. Though you've cut out some of the trails we used to walk on, what you've done has made the park more accessible to more people (instead of my secret almost private place, which I do admittedly miss). However, the plans to close off upper Mori Trail and Lishumash trail are ill-advised. These trails provide a more rugged experience that dogs and owners need, move us away from people with little kids and strollers, and give people more exercise and dogs more places to sniff, without harming the vegetation or affecting wildlife. Your draft plan also cuts off all access to the Headlands, which is odd and unfair. It prevents us from the longer walks along the cliffs heading south, and from meeting up with the trail that leads to the Quarry, both popular and beautiful walks. Furthermore, the plan to close off the trail that leads north from lower Mori Road just before we reach the new ponds (this path fronts backyards), will cut off easy access from the entire neighborhood. I meet many elderly people, people in wheelchairs or with canes, and people with young kids who enter the park through this trail. Closing it off will cause all the people who live there to either have a much longer walk to the main entrance by the Moose Lodge, or they will have to drive there, increasing parking congestion amid much more inconvenience.

Corr. ID: 3781 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205172 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I walk from private property to less used trails at Mori Point, trails that will not be open to dogs in the Preferred Alternative. I object to the changes at Mori Point. Dog walking on less used paths reduces interactions between people who don't like dogs and dogs. Your trail eliminations at Mori Point forces everyone, regardless of their specific use, to use the same single path regardless of their activity. If you were concerned with recreational uses and reducing conflicts, more paths would reduce potential conflicts.

I am also concerned that unlabeled paths currently at Mori Point and marked for "Realignment" will be eliminated. I hope "Realignment" is not Park-Speak for remove.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

29277

Commenters did not support the preferred alternative as they felt that limiting the trail access would result in issues with enforcement.

Corr. ID: 3360 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203042 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As resident of Fairway Park, and a concerned citizen and responsible dog owner, I am compelled to comment on the ill-conceived preferred

dog policy for Mori Point as outlined on your website.

As many of my neighbors, part of my decision on choosing to live in Fairway Park was based on the proximity to open space, now GGNRA, Mori Point. I have walked my dog here on leash for 9 years, collected trash and reported illegal activity on this land to authorities on several occasions. These incidents have included off road vehicles and a dog attack by an uncontrolled, off leash dog. As encouraged by multiple GGNRA signs, I consider myself a steward of this land and most of my neighbors act in the same way. Fairway Park, by my most recent estimate, includes more than 40 dog owners many of whom frequently use Mori Point to walk their dogs. Unfortunately, I now feel my use of this space is threatened by a preferred policy which restricts on leash dogs to 2 trails passing through the space only. This policy is very confusing based on the environmental reviews on your website which state little to no impact on habitat by leashed dogs. Further confusing this preferred policy is the fact that trails which allow dogs on leash are all within 100-200 feet of trails which prohibit dogs even though they share the same watersheds and natural features.

Mori Point is bordered by the old quarry, Fairway Park neighborhood, Sharp Park Golf Course and beach promenade making it a multi-use recreational area, not a wilderness area. Restricting leashed dogs within Mori Point will likely not be well-accepted, making the regulation a difficult one to enforce. The enforcement plan of going to even more restrictive policy based on compliance rate of less than 75% is backward. If a regulation is not acceptable to a large percentage of people using the space, it is the regulation, not the people who are misguided. If dog policy is seen as inappropriate by many users, the land and habitat could be further damaged by people using the space during off hours.

Corr. ID: 3489

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 203343

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to add my concern about restricting leashed dogs on Mori Point.

Our daughter lives in Fairway Park and we have taken walks with their dog for about nine years.

Open space is hard to come by near a city. Many people have dogs and will be expected to bring them to an open space.

Requiring dogs to be on a leash is certainly reasonable and enforcement can be expected to be met with good will by most people.

An arbitrary rule restricting leashed dogs to only two paths is just asking for enforcement problems.

Response:

Lessening the dog walking privileges at Mori Point would negatively impact the enjoyment of visitors and residents at Mori Point, where people are already respectful of each other and the environment.

Concern ID:

31362

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

At Mori Point visitors are respectful of each other and the environment, and limitation of the current dog walking privileges would have a negative impact on the enjoyment of visitors at Mori Point.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3436

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 203237

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please continue to allow us to enjoy our home, our trails, the beauty of the ocean and environment and allow us to take walks with our children and our dogs, our family. My family enjoys walking the trails in Mori

Point, we often take our children and our dog. We enjoy the ocean, flowers, exercise and meeting our friends and strangers alike on the trail. We are respectful of the space, pick up any trash we see, stay on the trails and encourage others to do so. Taking away that privilege for our dogs will seriously impact the way we enjoy the space, exercise and our quality of life here in Pacifica.

MP1300 - Mori Point: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29276

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dogs should be banned from Mori Point (alternative D) because of the impact they have on animals and plants in the area. Commenters had seen dogs chasing birds and digging up plants.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1159 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193463 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Mori Point also needs rules banning dogs or requiring dogs to be on-leash. Dogs routinely chase migrating birds and shore birds on the beach and along the trails above the newly constructed stairs. On many occasions I've seen dogs digging up the wildflowers out on the point above the stairs at Mori Point.
Corr. ID: 1238 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 194897 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I love dogs, but I support prohibiting them completely from Mori Point. As someone who witnesses the heart-breaking impact of dog-owners on the very few areas where wild animals and plants can exist, I beseech the GGNRA to prohibit dogs from Mori Point.
Corr. ID: 3927 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 205768 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Since the leash law is not or cannot be enforced at Milagra Ridge and Mori Point parks I support an alternative to the leash law that prohibits dogs from these parks, and designates space within the north San Mateo park system that allows free-running dogs in an area which will not adversely impact safe and enjoyable use by all people, and will not cause damage to native environments. I would think the issues I've experienced are not specific to just the above mentioned two parks and so think this alternative should apply to other parks as well, but I can only speak from personal experience at these two.

Concern ID: 29278

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support alternative E and feel that dog walking issues should be resolved by enforcement.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1131 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192446 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I don't think any additional rules are required, and the problems perceived could be solved simply by enforcing the current rules. I would prefer options A or E for Sweeney ridge, Mori Point, and Milagra Ridge.

Concern ID: 29279

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters supported Alternative A as they wanted to retain current on-leash walking areas at Mori Point. They felt having access to current trails was beneficial to their experience at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 821 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 186095 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: FOR MORI POINT, Pacifica. I prefer Alternative A (on-leash walking for all developed trails) to the current preferred alternative. The Park

Service preferred alternative seems to allow dogs in the most sensitive habitat (frog ponds) while prohibiting them from being walked on some of the less-used hill trails and also the Pollywog Path which runs along the back fence of Fairway Park residences, and is used very frequently for access by residents of that neighborhood. There also does not seem to be any useful purpose served by preventing leashed dogs from using Upper Mori Trail, Lishumsa Trail, the Headlands Trail, or the Bluff Grail-- all of which are quite far from the ponds & protected habitat. and also areas less likely to be used by families with small children or elderly visitors, as they are comparatively more rugged with a steep upgrade.

I would note that I see no problem with closing the Bootlegger's Steps to dogs. Dogs don't need stairs and that particular path is more often frequented by new and infrequent visitors to the park rather than those who regularly walk their dogs in the area.

Corr. ID: 1724 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191175 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My main area of concern is Mori Point, because I live in Fairway Park. The availability of the trails as they are (Alt. A) is my strong choice. I walk one dog nearly every day, and access via Pollywog Path. My dog is always leashed.

Corr. ID: 3111 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201517 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I regularly use the trails of Mori Point and find the status quo quite satisfactory. Dog owners are generally VERY responsible and problems are rare. There seems to be a synergy in the area between human use (including people with dogs) and efforts to plan native native plant species and remove invasives. I see no need for any change, especially to a policy that will not allow even leashed-dogs on many of the trails.

Corr. ID: 4118 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208516 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: MORI POINT - I support Alternative A, No Action (in harmony with 1979 Pet Policy). I have walked all areas of Mori Point for almost 15 years. Never in that time have I been impacted in my enjoyment of the area by individuals with on leash dogs. Watching dogs enjoy the area along with their caretakers has increased my enjoyment of the area. (I do not support off leash dog walking along the more popular trails, as I have on occasion observed unleashed dogs running through the brush including areas that are sensitive to other wildlife.)

MP1400 - Mori Point: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29271

CONCERN STATEMENT:

ROLA - Mori Point should be open to off-leash dog walking, or should include areas for off-leash dog walking, such as west of Moose Lodge and an area adjacent to the beach. If this site was open to off-leash dog walking, residents would not need to drive elsewhere to walk their dogs. Additionally visitors did not feel their safety or experience was compromised by off-leash dogs at this site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 698 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182688 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding Mori Point dog walking. I'd like to suggest using two (2) areas for "off leash" walking. First site: Approximately 100 yards WEST from the Moose Lodge there is a small bowl (approx 3 acres) located between the service road/trail and upper hiking trail. That bowl would allow off leash dog walking away from the main park

habitat/trails.

Second site: Far west, adjacent to the beach, at the SOUTH end of the berm there is a small grove of Cypress trees (approx 1 acre). This site would require some fencing, but it would serve the off leash dog walking community well.

Corr. ID: 1258

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194956

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would love to ask GGNRA to please consider leave Mori Point to be the open park for dogs so, they can run free and get good exercise and besides this park used to be open space for all the dogs and never have any regulation before. Please re-consider to keep this park to be the open park specially for the residence that live around Mori Point so we do not have to drive somewhere else to take our dog for walk.

Corr. ID: 1739

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191195

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Mori Point was bought by Pacifica residents through the Pacifica land trust, at considerable expense, funded by donations - and given to the Park Service with the expectation of preserving existing use.

The proposed plan takes away what we fought so hard to save.

Keep ALL Mori Point trails open to leashed dogs.

Consider also creating some off-leash areas at teh top of the ridge.

Corr. ID: 3630

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204113

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to strongly urge you to continue to allow off-leash dogs in the GGNRA properties of Sweeney Ridge and Mori Point in Pacifica, CA. I understand that the GGNRA typically requires on-leash dogs for the sake of safety. I can attest that in the 4 years I have lived in Pacifica, and in the two weeks that I have been running my dog off-leash, I have never encountered a malicious, out-of-control dog. The high ratio of open space to people ensures that I don't encounter more than 10 dogs while out running in a 1-hour time period. I feel that this helps to limit any negative, defensive behavior that one might see at other areas (such as Fort Funston). Furthermore, I have never seen handlers with packs of large dogs (Pits, Rotweilers, etc...) using the GGNRA properties in Pacifica to exercise/parade their dogs. I have never felt like my safety was ever compromised in Pacifica due to an off-leash dog. PLEASE continue to allow off-leash dogs in Pacifica GGNRA properties!

Corr. ID: 4640

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227729

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Park Unit: Mori Point

Voice Control: All other trails

On Leash: On the trails surrounding the frog ponds and along city traffic routes

No Dogs: No Dogs None

Nearby San Pedro Valley Park does not allow any dogs.

The adjacent Sharp Park and Rockaway Beach trails all have a high concentration of

voice control dogs and all these areas have traditionally been under voice control.

So it would be difficult for someone to get a no dog experience even if these trails were designated as no dog.

Concern ID:

29272

CONCERN

On-Leash - Commenters expressed a desire to keep Pollywog path, bootlegger's

STATEMENT:

steps, headlands trail, Lishumsha, and other areas open to on-leash dogs. They felt impacts to the nearby pond habitats were not significant enough to warrant limiting dogs on the trail, and that safety was improved at the site by maintaining access to these trails.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 752

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 185428

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Bootleggers Steps are man made (earth moved, vegetation removed, wildlife disturbed in the process) and a dog using them would cause no additional harm. I climb those steps every weekend with my dog and closing those steps to our use would negatively impact my experience. Please change the plan for Mori Point to allow use of all trails and Bootleggers Steps to dog walkers

Corr. ID: 1706

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191130

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Mori Point: First thank you for the excellent historical references done on signage about the Old Mori Inn and the Mori Family. I'm a member of the Pacifica Historical Society and you did a comendable job.

Mori Trails; I support Mapt 17-E for on leash dog walking, but want access to the bootleggers Steps as well as Lishumsha trail. Also, I'd like to continue walking my dog on leash out to the end ofthe Point at Sunset.

Lishumsha Trail in particular is very smooth for wheels. My neighbor uses an electric cart and occasioanlly comes out with us on walks. Keeping this section of the trail open to on leash dogs also keeps open a good access for disabled visitors with pets!

Bootlegger's Steps are easy for me to go up with my dog, but I can't go down them. Knee problems! Please keep the steps open to on leash too.

Corr. ID: 4688

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210090

Organization Type: State Government

Representative Quote: Mori Point:

We suggest that the trails designated on Map 17C as "Tmigtac" and "Polywog" trails be modified to allow on-leash dog access. We believe the likelihood of either the red-legged frog or the San Francisco garter snake being harmed or negatively affected is extremely remote. Furthermore, the "Polywog" trail is an example of where it is important to maintain neighborhood access from Old Mori Point road to Fairway Drive. This trail runs parallel to a long fence line and is clearly not a species migratory corridor.

Concern ID:

29274

CONCERN

[A loop trail should be created to better serve users of Mori Point](#)

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1751

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191218

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a retired disabled person. It is very important for me to walk my dog off leash because I use a cane. He is a good dog!

I think dogs are generally better behaved off leash.

Mori Point- can we have a loop trail with leashes?

Ft. Funston - PLEASE leave the trails off leash!

I never saw dogs fighting there.

I feel happy meeting the dogs + their people while off leash

Corr. ID: 3157 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202886 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: At Mori Point, for security reasons, please continue to allow access on the Pollywag Path. There have been several cars broken into while parked near the Moose Lodge entrance.

And for a mere scenic reason, please keep the Lishima trail open in order to accommodate a return loop trail.

Corr. ID: 4143 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208604 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to express my support for the preferred alternative, with some basic adjustments. I base my support on the following:

The basic adjustments I suggest include a better loop at Mori Point, an internal loop at Fort Funston, and some modified alternative to the Muir Beach regulation that also ensures natural resource protection goals are met. At Muir Beach, I fear the residents and regular users will not abide to a "no dog" rule which could only create tensions at that site and elsewhere.

MR1100 - Milagra Ridge: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29334

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The preferred alternative is supported for Milagra Ridge. This alternative provided areas for dog and no-dog experiences, and the continuation of on-leash dog walking is most beneficial. This alternative would protect Mission blue butterfly habitat.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 755 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 185444 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree with the options chosen for Milo and Milagra Ridges. Thank you for keeping the areas open for dogs and I believe in these areas that on leash is best.

Corr. ID: 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates
Comment ID: 209127 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: MILAGRA RIDGE. Dogs should be restricted to leashes on the fire road, trail to overlook and Woorld War II bunker, and the Milagra Battery Trail future connector to lower Milagra) to protect the Mission blue butterfly.

Corr. ID: 4354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209530 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: MILAGRA RIDGE

This area has wonderful views and its scenery has a wild aspect. Its many different species of wildflowers contribute to that scene and I understand there is much wildlife. I was impressed with the protective post-and-rail (wire) fencing of sensitive areas; it did not dominate the scene but it would keep dogs and people out of habitat.

I was shown the transects of the people who do butterfly studies in the area, and was told of the many volunteers who work to keep out the exotics and help with restoration of degraded areas.

All the dogs I saw on a sunny Sunday afternoon were leashed. I agree that anyone walking more than 3 dogs along the proposed trail, even on leashes, could affect the habitat and wildlife.

I think the Preferred Alternative is the right choice for Milagra Ridge. It has areas

both for leashed dogs and for people who do not wish to be with dogs. Although I noted there previously have been citations for dogs off leash, I think this is a place where community cooperation and compliance could be fostered.

Concern ID: 29335

CONCERN STATEMENT: The preferred alternative would help curb use and impacts by off-leash dogs in this area, which would significantly improve the safety and experience of visitors, particularly those who do not enjoy dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3138 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203736 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support Alternative B (the preferred alternative) for the San Mateo County properties.

However, in my 13 years of experience hiking in this area, voice control DOES NOT WORK for many dogs and should never be allowed on any of these lands. Aggressive dogs can cause significant safety hazards and limit the enjoyment of others who want to use the land without fear of being attacked by a dog. These off leash dogs also do significant damage to trails and foliage, scare and chase other natural animals in the habitat (birds, rabbits, etc) and generally create havoc in the entire natural environment.

MR1200 - Milagra Ridge: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29336

CONCERN STATEMENT: The preferred alternative is opposed for Milagra Ridge because the trails available under this alternative are not sufficient. Commenters noted that they had not seen any impacts to wildlife and vegetation, and felt that the restrictions were not necessary.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1702 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191121 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Milagra Ridge- proposed plan essentially closes the entire park to dogs - the single open trail is inadequate

Corr. ID: 3726 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202346 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2.) Milagra Ridge in Pacifica. This is a wonderful space that is lightly utilized (some of the time I'm there alone with my dogs). The heaviest users are people with dogs, and everyone I've seen with just a couple of exceptions respects the on leash requirements here. We like to walk along the dirt trails as well as the paved ones, for the variety, for the exercise, and for the views. I've never heard of any negative encounters between dogs and wildlife (the one time we saw a deer I held my dogs close and there was no interaction). Closing off any of it to dogs on leash is unfair and unnecessary to protect this park. Dogs have been using it for many many years with no ill effects to either wildlife, vegetation or other users, and I strongly urge you to continue the current policies of on leash dog access.

Corr. ID: 3740 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204277 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Since moving here I find that the GGNRA is proposing to limit the places I can walk my dog even on an a leash, and is planning on limit further off leash walking. Sweeney Ridge where I often go with my dog will ban dogs completely and Milagra ridge will limit the trails available to me with my dog. As I understand it the area for off leash walking at Fort Funston will also be decreased. We live in an Urban area one with many dogs. By limiting access to this degree, becomes collective punishment of all dog owners. Rather than hold those

who do not respect others, accountable all of us must pay. We live in a lovely natural place. All, including dogs have a right to share it. There should be more off lease areas not less.

Corr. ID: 4126

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208547

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I disagree with the proposed trail usage reductions under the preferred alternatives for Mori Pt, Milagra and Sweeney Ridge. The trails and paved areas at Milagra Ridge protect both plant and wildlife, there is no need to reduce trail access at all. The other areas can continue to support access to people with dogs without disturbing wildlife

MR1300 - Milagra Ridge: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID:

29337

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Alternative A was requested by commenters, who felt that the existing policy is working fine, and that other impacts from dogs could be mitigated by other means. They felt Milagra Ridge is a less spoiled area, and that the current restrictions were adequate to protect wildlife.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1912

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192587

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ban fire arms!! from Parklands next to housing. I generally oppose removing privileges. Therefore I support Alt. A in Mori Point, Milagra Ridge + Sweeney Ridge (these are dog-walking areas! In these economic times, when we are all being asked to "cut back", please allow us to continue the dog walking trails we currently enjoy. This is important for our physical + emotional well being. For the record, I can support "on-leash only" on GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3494

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203371

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Second, the rationale for the complete ban on dogs from trails such as Milagra Ridge seems highly flawed. At the March 9 open house in Pacifica I was told by the ranger there the GGNRA wanted to completely ban dogs from Milagra Ridge because it constituted one of the less spoiled natural areas in the county and hosted a variety of birds. The fact that Milagra Ridge is an island ecosystem with a wide array of species is undisputed, and is part of what makes the area special. However, this is true today although dogs are currently permitted there on leash. Since birds and other wildlife are clearly happy there, why change what is already working when it is at the expense of people like me who want to use these trails with my dogs? On Milagra Ridge in particular there is such thick bush and foliage on each side of the trail that it is almost impossible for dogs, on leash or off, to leave the trail and disrupt the animals. Furthermore, these trails are sufficiently steep and remote that very few people (with or without dogs) actually use them except die-hard hikers and trail runners like myself (again, especially beyond the 2-3 miles past the parking lot). The decision to ban dogs entirely from them seems based on an idealistic vision that is not in keeping with the GGNRA's mission. It does not take into consideration the traditional use of this land or the reality of what is working there today already with the current leash law in place.

Corr. ID: 4640

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227730

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Milagra

There is no scientific evidence indicating that dog recreation, on-leash or by voice-control, has any significant impact on visitors or the natural environment. I'm simply designating this as on-leash to provide for balanced recreation for the few

people that desire to avoid dog interaction.

-None, except consider a two hour morning and two hour evening time window to meet the needs of local residents

-All on-leash

-None

Notch Trail, Sawyer Camp Trail and San Bruno Mountain are all in the nearby area and do not allow dogs.

The park trail system criss-cross and there is little advantage to designating no dog trails as dog would still be nearby and crossing a fearful person's path.

Concern ID: 29338

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Alternative E would be preferred at Milagra Ridge, as additional rules were not necessary, and that problems could be fixed by better enforcement. Commenters noted that they did not feel the loop to the top of the hill should be closed.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1935 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192603 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Milagra Ridge: Trails/pavement are wide enough to accomodate on leash walking without trampling habitat. Why close road to top? There is sufficient passage area to avoid conflict.

Concern ID: 29339

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters felt that since it would be difficult to enforce leash laws at Milagra Ridge, it would be better to ban dogs from the site.](#)

[For representative quote, please see Concern 29276 \(MP1300\), Comment 205768](#)

MR1400 - Milagra Ridge: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29340

CONCERN STATEMENT: [On-Leash - Commenters questioned why the loop trail was not included in the plans, as the trail has a barrier on both sides to prevent damage from dogs.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 941 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191459 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Milagra Ridge: why is the Loop trail off limits to leashed dogs? The trail has barriers on both sides. What is the argument for not allowing on leash dogs?

Concern ID: 29341

CONCERN STATEMENT: [ROLA - Having an off-leash area at Milagra Ridge in an area where it will not cause damage would be beneficial to visitors. Visitor use at this site is low, and the site could support off-leash dog walking.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 841 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 186201 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Milagra Ridge: the parking at Milagra Ridge limits the amount of use. Generally only 6-8 cars can park there at any one time. I take my dog there regularly and might occasionally bump into 3-4 people during an entire hour-long walk. I think that this area should be relaxed to voice-control, but that didn't seem to be an option.
Corr. ID: 4102 **Organization:** SFDOG
Comment ID: 208454 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In addition, the DEIS should add the following off-leash,

voice control areas in San Mateo:

- 1) a voice control trail from the Bay-side to the Coast-side on Sweeney Ridge (e.g., Sneath Lane to Fassler)
- 2) Mori Point off-leash, voice control everywhere except on-leash around the frog ponds and traffic areas and no dogs on the the Upper Mori Trail
- 3) Milagra should be off-leash, voice control everywhere

There is no justification presented in the DEIS to justify the restrictions proposed to off-leash in San Mateo.

Corr. ID: 4621 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207038 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If off leash recreation is also provided in GGNRA sites in San Mateo County, a truly preferred alternative would be created.

MT1000 - Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

Concern ID: 30153

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters share legal advice with GGNRA.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 202 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180619 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am an attorney, and would like to share a legal principle that I think applies to the alternatives proposed in the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan: Equitable estoppel. This legal doctrine serves to "estop" someone from making a legal argument or taking an action that affects another's rights when four elements are present. In this situation, I believe that the GGNRA is estopped from radically restricting off-leash access by residents of the affected areas and their companion canines because these elements apply, as follows: (1) the party to be estopped (in this case, the GGNRA) was apprised of the fact that dog ownership has been growing exponentially in all of the areas affected by this proposal; (2) the GGNRA intended that the liberal off-leash policy be acted upon, or acted so that the parties asserting the estoppel (in this case the dog owners) had a right to believe it was so intended; (3) the dog owners were ignorant of the true state of facts, that being that the off-leash area could be radically restricted; and (4) the dog owners relied upon the conduct of the GGNRA to their detriment.

Concern ID: 30156

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters have comments concerning Guide/Service/Companion Dogs at GGNRA](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 277 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180903 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Most people with pet dogs are not aware that there are state and federal laws governing distracting a guide dog. An unleashed dog charging the guide fits that criteria. Perhaps leash regulations will help prevent the unleashed dogs owner from paying for that very expensive guide dog.

Corr. ID: 277 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180906 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: An unleashed dog rushing the guide dog team can make the guide dog skittish and afraid. That puts the guide dog team at risk. If the guide dog is more worried about being rushed by another dog, that guide is not doing it's job and injury to both the guide dog and guide dog user could occur.

Corr. ID: 1816 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191806 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would also like to see codified guidelines on what extra privileges "companion dogs" would have, if any. I do not believe they should have any extra privileges. Several dog owners bring their dogs into restaurants in San Francisco because their doctors have written them notes say that the dog is a "companion dog" and as such they get special dog tags. If dog owners only have to get a note from their doctors to have an untrained dog outside of the purview of your new rules, the rules themselves will rapidly become feckless.

Corr. ID: 3096

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201487

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Some people need a guide dog or have a service dog and they need to go places like parks, trails and beaches. And people who are blind or have a disability sometimes need a dog to help them walk. Service dogs should be allowed almost any where because they are really needed by their owners.

Corr. ID: 3153

Organization: Guide Dog Users, Inc.

Comment ID: 202873

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to you on behalf of Guide Dog Users, Inc. (GDUI) an international organization dedicated to advocacy, peer support, public education and all aspects of training, working and living with dogs specially-trained to guide blind and visually-impaired people.

GDUI urges you to support the adoption of regulations which would create physically enclosed spaces as off-leash dog play areas for the safety of guide dog handlers and their dogs.

In a 2003 GDUI survey, 89% of guide dog handlers reported incidents of interference from unleashed dogs, placing these visually impaired individuals in serious danger. Even when an interfering pet dog simply wants to play, the team's attention to important elements of safe travel is distracted making the blind person vulnerable to the dangers of traffic and other environmental challenges. 42% of respondents have been the victims of attacks by unleashed dogs causing physical and psychological injury to both members of the team and even death or premature retirement of the guide dog which can cost more than \$50,000 to replace.

GDUI supports the enforcement of leash laws in general because such laws provide important safeguards for people, our pets, wildlife, and parks. Enforcement of the National Park System's leash law and the creation of off leash play areas for dogs would insure dogs have reasonable access to the Park without jeopardizing the safety of disabled individuals partnered with specially trained assistance dogs, pet dogs, wildlife, or park visitors.

GDUI urges creation of off leash play areas for pet dogs at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Corr. ID: 3721

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202306

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Since there already is evidence that off-leash dogs DO attack Guide Dogs, that means it likely the person using a Guide Dog also is entangled or engulfed in the attacks of off-leash dogs on Guide Dogs. Protection of that user of a Guide Dog's services also is not addressed.

Since Guide Dogs are attacked, the larger issue of safety for vulnerable populations also is not addressed. Not only do people using guide dogs have a greater vulnerability, but so do many people with mobility impairments, toddlers, pre-schoolers, adults pushing a baby in a stroller, a group of primary grade children out on a field trip and some seniors.

Members of all those groups have slower speed, reaction time, and mobility options than those who wrote this document and than those likely to be monitoring and / or enforcing any off-leash regulations.

Which also shows how narrow is the experiential thinking that produced this narrow-focus document that deals only with:

off-leash dogs, and endangered flora and fauna, but not with Guide Dogs, Service Animals, and the people who rely on them.

By considering a deviation from NPS standards, GGNRA is opening up the entire system to a crazy-quilt of possible local options, which will be unknown to visitors from outside that area. Despite disclaimers to the contrary, any deviations from national NPS standards that GGNRA authorizes will be used by others, elsewhere, for their "local rules".

Even allowing consideration of off-leash dogs also lessens the importance of native and entrenched flora and fauna.

This document's neglect of addressing the safety needs of vulnerable populations ASSUMES all visitors to / users of GGNRA facilities are all fully able-bodied, agile, mobile, and possessed of all their cognitive faculties.

Somehow, the writers of this document got stuck somewhere in the early 1960s, ignoring the passage of the Older Americans Act in 1965 and the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act [A.D.A. in 1990.

Since the 1965 Older Americans Act was in effect when NEPA was passed in 1969, there should be no professional excuse for ignoring the impacts of that 1965 law on a 1969 law.

Further, with passage of the civil right law known as the A.D.A., people with disabilities are, supposedly, guaranteed a right to all programs and services a government agency provides.

If GGNRA allows off-leash dogs anywhere, that will effectively block some people with disabilities from also going into those areas.

Corr. ID: 3721

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202303

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This document is flawed as to scope and to how it avoids addressing laws and factors passed after NEPA went into effect. SO, this document at least needs a supplement or revision, if not a substantial re-do.

NOWHERE is there any mention of or concern for a specific animal grouping-- guide dogs and service dogs.

Nor is there any reference to protecting vulnerable HUMAN populations.

Yet, Guide Dogs for the Blind has been in San Rafael, CA, since the 1942-- LONG before NEPA was passed and long before the establishment of the GGNRA. Worse, in the files of GGNRA is a 2005 letter from Guide Dogs for the Blind, wherein their field service manager cites a 2003 survey indicating that:

89% of their graduates [EIGHTY-NINE PER CENT] "have had Guide Dogs interfered with by off-leash dogs"; and further that

42% of their graduates [FORTY-TWO PER CENT]

" have had their Guide Dogs ATTACKED [[emphasis mine]] by off-leash dogs".

When a person using A Guide Dog loses those services, it can take up to two years and cost \$50,000, or more, to get a new Guide Dog. During that interim training period, the mobility of that person whose guide dog was incapacitated is greatly limited.

If, contrary to existing policy elsewhere within the NPS system GGNRA allows off-leash dogs, then GGNRA can be viewed as liable for injuries to the Guide Dog, to the person, and to training and replacement costs.

Corr. ID: 4642 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208825 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A positive attitude toward companion dogs is not universally held. I attended the NPS open house March 9 in Pacifica, where I had a discussion with Park Ranger, Daphne, who commented that some park visitors did not want to even see a dog on the trails. To Daphne this seemed to be a credible objection. It should be apparent that no policy will satisfy all concerns and that this level of dog aversion falls outside of any reasonable goal.

Concern ID:

30157

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[Commenters have questions regarding existing GGNRA regulations or the signage/fencing at the park, and the requirement to pick up after pets.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 658 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181514 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We could find no mention of requiring dog owners to pick up their pets' feces.

Corr. ID: 1390 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195294 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe that new restrictions placed on dog owners will not be overwhelmingly obeyed; the present restrictions are either not known or obeyed by many dog owners.

Corr. ID: 1696 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191109 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I try to keep my dogs behaving properly & were permitted. However it is very difficult to tell regarding certain area if they are protected or not. The fencing is inadequate!!

Concern ID:

30159

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[Commenters have concerns about the plan's impacts on socioeconomics.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3586 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 203670 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: "Future Considerations: ?We are concerned 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 Pacifica's restaurants, hotels, or other retail outlets?."

Unfortunately the City of Pacifica sometimes works against its own best self interest and has failed to subsume the interest of dog-owners to the wider economic benefits derived from being adjacent to a National Park. On more than one occasion the City Council has been presented with studies that demonstrate that economic growth near national parks outpaces other areas that lack similar natural amenities. On the other hand increased dog presence in the GGNRA will cause deterioration in the visitor experience which can generate both social and economic costs. For this reason dog access should be given little weight as far as it's economic

importance, must be balanced among more compelling reasons and its potentially negative effects must be managed.

Concern ID: 30160
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters have opinions regarding the number of dogs per person allowed at GGNRA.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1344 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195178 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I think Dogs should be required to be on leash at ALL times! And only 2 dogs per person
Corr. ID: 1820 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191915 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I do think that it is important to limit the number of dogs that one person can walk in the GGNRA and agree with your recommendations on that point.

Concern ID: 30161
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters are concerned that the process of this DEIS is not consistent with the Crissy Field FONSI or that the DEIS is not consistent/has a discrepancy with the GGNRA GMP.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4088 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208352 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: And one other point that needs to be conveyed is the fact that according to the GGNRA's PEPC website regarding the GGNRA's new General Management Plan (GMP) Newsletter #5, dated Summer 2009, states that "the new plan will not revise decisions made in recent management plans for the Presidio, Crissy Field, Fort Point or Fort. Baker". Simple logic should prevail that the Crissy Field Environmental Assessment will stand as is and 70 acres of off leash dog walking under voice control remains in place as was approved by the GGNRA/NPS. Clearly there is a discrepancy between the GGNRA's draft Dog Management Plan/DEIS and the new GGNRA GMP.

Concern ID: 30163
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters urge the NPS to protect the resources at GGNRA.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2615 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195524 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: This country needs to do every single thing it can to protect and preserve our wildlife. It is a symbol of a nations respect for it's heritage.
Corr. ID: 2635 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195469 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: * Natural and cultural resources must be protected. Recreation should not undermine these main goals.
Corr. ID: 2646 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195531 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: We need to preserve our wildlife and their habitats for our future generations to enjoy.
Corr. ID: 2693 **Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association
Comment ID: 195526 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Please do everything possible to protect the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We are stewards of the environment, and need to stop

causing irreparable damage to the living things around us.

Thank you in advance proving that our trust is not misplaced: do the right thing.

Corr. ID: 2695 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195525 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Owing to the diversity of species that find sanctuary there, San Francisco's Golden Gate Park is unique among urban parks and should be protected.

Corr. ID: 2726 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195582 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please protect Golden Gate's imperiled wildlife from harassment by unregulated recreation.

Concern ID: 30165

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters request that the park publish the public comments in the DEIS or that an independent review of the comments be completed (specifically, that comments are not merely reviewed by Park staff since NPS wrote the DEIS which represents a conflict of interest) or that the cost of the DEIS and the number of hours charged by employees for this DEIS be made public.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1451 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199728 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned that NPS/GGNRA will ignore public comment. For this process to be considered valid, you must be transparent. I strongly request (insist if I may) that you publicly publish all comments received.

Corr. ID: 4235 **Organization:** Save Off Leash, SFDog, Sierra Club, Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 208599 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The NPS must have non-GGNRA-staff or GGNRA-associated researchers to independently analyze and review the public comment and to independently determine how the Alternatives must be changed (or even if the DEIS should be thrown out and the whole process started over) as a result of the public comment.

Corr. ID: 4235 **Organization:** Save Off Leash, SFDog, Sierra Club, Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 208597 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We demand an independent review of the comments from the public. The GGNRA has said they will give the public comments to their own staff -- the very same people who did the flawed, biased research that the GGNRA uses to justify restricting off-leash -- to decide if the criticisms of that work is valid. This is an egregious conflict of interest.

Concern ID: 30166

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters request that the DEIS should address options for changing the management of GGNRA from the NPS to another agency.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3142 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202645 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please be sure to address the options for changing who manages the GGNRA. I believe national recreational areas can be managed by organizations other than NPS. Thus, NPS restrictions should not be imposed upon GGNRA. If need be, how do we change who manages GGNRA (e.g., Forestry Service)?

Concern ID: 30167

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

Commenters are concerned the proposed DEIS will cause them to drive longer commutes to exercise their dogs.

Corr. ID: 1893

Organization: University of San Francisco

Comment ID: 200618

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Also, it is entirely possible that there would be conflicts between the dogs themselves in this new, overcrowded environment. Finally, from a broad environmental perspective, let me point out that if I drive elsewhere (say to the East Bay which has more dog-friendly parks), I will be increasing my global carbon footprint and thus degrading the environment in other ways. Think of the big picture before moving forward.

Corr. ID: 2271

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201055

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please don't make me drive one hour each to enjoy a day's hike with my dog, just think of the added congestion and pollution!

Corr. ID: 2880

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202899

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am concerned for many reasons, some of which include:
- Many dog owners will be required to drive great distances to properly exercise pets, which is not a positive thing all around or for NPS land.

Concern ID:

30169

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

Commenters have specific concerns that will result from the DEIS at particular GGNRA sites.

Corr. ID: 3966

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206071

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned that the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan overly restricts access of dog owners to a unique oasis in an urban area which provides a healthy outlet for dogs and their owners. I am also concerned that the new rules will only increase the likelihood of an increasing tendency in recent years for Fort Funston to be locked to completely restrict and block access to anyone in the early morning hours.

Concern ID:

30170

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

Commenters suggest that if the DEIS will be implemented, that the changes go into effect after a grace period (14 years, the average life span of a dog).

Corr. ID: 3996

Organization: Private citizen

Comment ID: 207475

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a responsible, working, tax-paying San Francisco resident and dog-owner I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan.

In particular, it was the 1979 Pet Policy where the city of San Francisco gave much of the land to the GGNRA with the express purpose that it would be used as it had been historically for recreational purposes, which includes dog walking that ultimately tipped the scale in favor of us getting our dog.

We are positively behind the idea of establishing professional dog walker rules and fees.

If off-leash areas are taken away we really may have to consider leaving the city of San Francisco now that we own and are responsible for the well-being of a large, energetic dog.. At the VERY least, I feel it would only be fair, if restrictions are to be imposed, that they go into effect after a 14 year grace period, allowing any new

dog owner the current rules for the lifetime of an average dog. I'm not sure we would have made the decision to own a dog if it weren't for the current Pet Policy.

Concern ID: 30171

CONCERN STATEMENT: A commenter has requested to know who the cooperating agencies are that have been involved in the EIS process.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4070 **Organization:** Mar Vista Stables

Comment ID: 207682 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 4)Who are the cooperating agencies in this process? When were they involved? Did they sign an MOU identifying their role in the process?

Concern ID: 30172

CONCERN STATEMENT: There are questions concerning the DEIS/ FEIS distribution, specifically, why wasn't the DEIS available in other languages or why wasn't a request sent out to the mailing list asking the public which format they would like to receive the DEIS in (hard copy vs. electronic) to save resources?

For representative quotes, please see Concern Statements 29516 (PS1000), Comment 207685 and Concern 29519 (PS1000), Comment 208560.

Concern ID: 30174

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters have requested that justification for the dismissal of alternatives be provided.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4461 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208608 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Provide site-specific need for action justifications and dismissals of suggested alternatives; use objective standards that would apply to any recreational activities such as equestrians, boaters, fishermen, surfers, bicyclists, beach-goers, joggers, walkers, etc.

Concern ID: 30176

CONCERN STATEMENT: A commenter has concerns regarding the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4704 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209710 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In 2006 Suzanne Valentine filed a Freedom of Information Act that requested the data, documents, and/or staff report that justified the DEIS. She got a reply saying that 'the staff reports and other documents you request do not exist at this time'.

Concern ID: 31663

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters questioned why monitoring was not completed in GGNRA as it is in other parks, and noted the importance of such monitoring in making such management decisions.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4677 **Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog

Comment ID: 227499 **Organization Type:** Civic Groups

Representative Quote: A subsection of the aforementioned web site (Program Goals) discusses the goals of park monitoring: "Natural resource monitoring provides site-specific information needed to understand and identify change in complex, variable, and imperfectly understood natural systems and to determine whether observed changes are within natural levels of variability or may be indicators of unwanted human influences. Thus, monitoring provides a basis for

understanding and identifying meaningful change in natural systems characterized by complexity, variability, and surprises. Monitoring data help to define the normal limits of natural variation in park resources and provide a basis for understanding observed changes; monitoring results may also be used to determine what constitutes impairment and to identify the need to initiate or change management practices."

As discussed above, it seems impossible that GGNRA management would undertake a management change as proposed in this DEIS without any evidence of monitoring as a means to identify the alleged impairment.

Concern ID:

31921

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Air quality could be significantly impacted under the proposed plan. Although car trips would be short, a majority of emissions occur during engine warm-up. There may be implications to air quality, as the local air basin is in nonattainment.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4666

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 227792

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS acknowledges that the alternatives could affect visitation patterns (p. 23). For me it will cause me to drive every morning to walk my dog on the beach where I could previously walk. If I am unable to walk my dog on Ocean Beach, I will have to get into my car and drive to the LOLA to the north unless I have an abundance of time, which is not the case when walking my dog in the morning before work. This will result in 10 additional car trips per week - albeit short ones. But while the trips would be short, the majority of vehicle emissions occur during engine warm-up and represent new emissions under the action alternatives that would not be in the air under the existing conditions. And this is just for me - one person. The hundreds of people affected by this plan necessitate this analysis in the EIS. Some of the restrictions are so severe that it will force people to drive much further to obtain an comparable nature experience. Sites that are more remote that will prohibit dogs entirely, such as Muir beach, will result in even longer vehicle trips. A discussion of potential air quality impacts from the alternatives should be included.

NL1100 - New Lands: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID:

29384

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Keep New Lands dog free. Commenters have stated that New Lands such as Rancho Coral are abundant with wildlife and contain newly restored wetlands which they believe are not compatible with off-leash dog walking. Also due to safety issue concerns (i.e., conflicts with dogs and visitors who do not prefer dogs) commenters prefer alternative D.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2790

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 201139

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a resident of Montara who lives on the North end near the Rancho Coral de Tierra (RCT) open space adjacent to Montara. I walk the trails on a regular basis and have personal experiences that are prompting me to express this opinion on the dog policy.

First and foremost the area is teeming with wildlife. The area near Highway One has a newly restored wetlands. I see Blue Herons and other large birds in the open space on a regular basis. Off leash dogs are not compatible with the wildlife. Two days ago I came upon a Great Blue Heron on the trail and had about 5 minutes to quietly observe before off-leash dog walkers came along and spooked it. They made no attempt to leash their dogs when they saw the Heron. I have also observed

dogs chasing terrified deer with no responsible humans in sight.

I have been threatened by growling off-leash dogs numerous times on the trails. The owners seem to think THEIR dog is not frightening to others. "He doesn't mean anything by it" is a common response to my concern. Voice/sight control is a joke.

We already have many local dog owners who do not obey the existing leash laws. They are vocal and seem to think their rights supersede the wildlife and other residents. This is wrong. To lessen the restrictions would be a big mistake and invite other park users to join those already threatening wildlife and humans.

Please establish the "Environmentally Preferred" Policy that is most protective of the resources, neighbors and visitors safety in RCT lands. At minimum dogs should NOT be allowed off-leash in Rancho Coral de Tierra at any time.

NL1200 - New Lands: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29385

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The preferred alternative is too restrictive since it does not allow for any dog walking activities in New Lands. Commenters have stated that no scientific studies or long-term monitoring of site-specific studies was done on New Lands to justify banning dogs. Commenters believe that the park did not take into consideration the needs of the New Lands neighboring communities (i.e., Montara). Community members state that they will have to drive to areas that allow dogs whereas currently they can walk to areas in New Lands to walk their dog. Alternative D will have a negative impact on the visitor experience of visitors who currently enjoy dog walking in New Lands. Commenters believe that there is enough land currently at New Lands (i.e., Rancho) to allow opportunities for multiple user groups (i.e., dogs, horses, bicycles, and hikers) to enjoy this open space. Commenters are concerned that dogs were banned from New Lands because the adjacent San Francisco Water District Lands does not allow dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 444 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181809 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Preferred alternative should be E, not D

I have been a responsible dog owner for 20 years and walking my dog in Rancho de Tierra lands for many years. There are very few people accessing this land and most are with their dogs. There is simple no one, on a percentage basis, to bother. Please do not over regulate land that is suppose to be for the good of us all.

A total ban on dogs is not acceptable (or a complete ban on dogs is extreme). Use this phrasing as opposed to specifying off leash, or on leash.

No scientific studies were done of Rancho lands to justify banning dogs.

Corr. ID: 1438 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 199580 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to offer my reaction to the GNRA Dog Management/EIS plan to exclude all dogs from "New Land" which would apply to Rancho Corral de Tierra property near Montara. I am whole-heartedly against this policy. I live in Montara and part of the charm to this wonderful small town is the ability to take my dog for long walks in open space. This is where I see my neighbors and chat with friends. After a long day, my dog and I take our daily walk to enjoy the scenery and relax a little. What I'm trying to convey is that though this

area is a part of the expansive GGNRA, it's not a densely packed urban area. Rather it is a large part of our small community where bikers, walkers, equestrians and dog walkers have successfully co-existed without government oversight for many years. A ban on dogs is plainly unfair and out of touch with the needs of our community.

Corr. ID: 3729

Organization: Montara Dog Group, Sierra Club

Comment ID: 204223

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This letter is asking for your support in allowing continued access for dogs in the Rancho Corral de Tierra, soon to be part of the GGNRA. The Montara Dog Group has encouraged responsible dog walking by starting a volunteer organization of people who remove dog waste from the mountain and by promoting leash protocols that respect all users in the park.

I encourage you to adopt Alternative E from the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan. This will allow continued on leash dog walking with off leash to be considered if certain criteria in the plan are met. The proposed Alternative prohibits dogs from an area where people have been walking them for 50 years.

Dogs do not harm the open space. [The Peninsula Humane Society Wildlife Expert supports this comment. There is no evidence collected by GGNRA to dispute it.] GGNRA is a RECREATION area, and walking dogs is a very popular form of recreation.

There is a lot of room in the Corral--and all users should be considered. Many trails afford opportunities for dogs, horses, bicycles and hikers to enjoy this open space area.

As you proceed with revising and modifying the dog plan, please select an option that includes dogs. 1. Dogs have been walked in this area for 50 years, and there is no documented evidence of harm. This activity benefits many local users, and it is vital that we be allowed to continue this activity.

2. I am concerned about the "Compliance Based Management" system and would like more specific guidelines about dog walking. For example, if a dog is off leash and not doing harm, would this cause the rules to revert to the next stringent level? Is there any community input allowed on this? Who would enforce Compliance Based Management.

I hope you plan to allow dogs based on site specific information for the Rancho. I would also like to see the rules depend on documentation of actual effects of dogs on the Rancho.

Corr. ID: 4639

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208786

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The New Lands in San Mateo County (where people have walked dogs off-leash for decades) need to be considered for off-leash recreation. The rationale that adjacent San Francisco Water District Lands don't allow dogs is hardly a reason to forbid off-leash recreation. The San Francisco Zoo is close to Fort Funston; the Zoo doesn't allow dogs; therefore, dogs shouldn't be at Fort Funston. Doesn't make much sense, does it?

Concern ID:

29386

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

ROLA - Off-leash dog walking should be allowed at New Lands (i.e., Rancho, Montara) since off-leash dog walking is allowed at sites in Marin and San Francisco counties. There is no balance between dog walking recreation (on-leash, off-leash, and no dog areas) and natural resources at New Lands. Commenters have stated that off-leash dog hiking has been a long standing tradition in the Rancho lands.

Concern ID:

29387

CONCERN

Commenters believe that the purpose of the park is for recreation and the preferred

STATEMENT: alternative does not allow for the recreation of dog walking at New Lands. Historical use of New Lands (if the area included dog walking or not) should have been considered in the analysis of New Lands. There is concern that if the park is considering opening New Lands (i.e., Rancho property) for horses then they should also consider opening it for dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1512 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191446 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Your Preferred alternative states that all new land donated will not be for off leash purposes. This is draconian and simply unfair. Your purposes, for the GGNRA is for RECREATIONAL purposes. These lands are NOT National Parks ' they are ex army installations and they were given in trust for you to administer in keeping with the original deed.

Corr. ID: 3714 **Organization:** Montara Dog Group
Comment ID: 202259 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I feel that dog walking qualifies as an appropriate use of a recreation area as defined by the enabling legislation. I feel off-leash dogs should be allowed in a portion of GGNRA property in proportion to the fraction of users that are dog walkers. There are three GGNRA properties with which I am familiar, Crissy Field and the Marin Headlands, where I walk dogs only occasionally; and Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho), where I walk dogs daily. The area defined for walking dogs off leash is far too small on Crissy Field, and your proposal to ban dogs entirely on Rancho is absurd. Apparently the current plan for the Rancho property involves opening it to horses and banning dogs. Although I have no objection to horses being on the property, dog walkers currently outnumber horse riders on the property by at least 20:1. Banning dogs entirely is obviously not in keeping with the wishes of the current users.

I also feel the Rancho property is a poor choice as a refuge for wildlife, although every effort should be made to preserve wildlife consistent with its use as a recreational property

Concern ID: 31822

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters were concerned that the restriction of dogs in the Rancho Corral de Tierra lands would limit access to McNee State Park, and increase parking issues, and requiring walking along a busy road. The current trailhead in Montara for Rancho is not well functioning, and the proposed options would result in a loss of access for homeowners and the fire department.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 484 **Organization:** Montara Dog Group
Comment ID: 181824 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Montara residents will be forced to drive to small parking lots at McNee Ranch or Montara Beach, and cross busy Highway 1 with their dogs, in order to access McNee Ranch, formerly a 10 minute walk through Rancho. Even more dangerous, Montara residents may elect to walk along Hwy 1 for 1/4 mile (there is virtually no shoulder on this stretch of highway) to get to McNee Ranch.

Corr. ID: 504 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181894 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Does it make sense, and is it safe, to force dog owners who want to access McNee State Park to either drive, trying to find parking on the highway, or walk half a mile on Highway 1, rather than walk across the old railroad grade or old roadway and trail from Montara?

Corr. ID: 3930 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 205796 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The current trailhead in Montara is not workable given it is

in the middle of a residential area and next to a school. There has been strong opposition to the LeConte trailhead already and Second Street is semi-private, narrow, unimproved dirt road. If individuals parked cars at either of these locations it would cut off fire department access to the homes and the Rancho.

Corr. ID: 4262

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209148

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am concerned that it will not be safe to force dog owners who want to

access McNee State Park to walk half a mile on Highway 1 rather than walk across the old railroad grade or old roadway and trail from Montara.

I have not seen reports that indicate that the pads of dog's feet are more damaging to the terrain than horse's hoofs, hiker's boots or mountain bike's tires

NL1300 - New Lands: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29388

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Alternative E is preferred because it allows dogs and is less restrictive. No scientific studies were done on New Lands to justify banning dogs. Commenters believe that dogs pose less of a threat to wildlife and wildlife habitat than horses and that the numbers of dog walkers currently using New Lands (i.e., Rancho) is low. Dog walking is a historical use at some New Lands (i.e., Montara) and should be allowed to continue. Commenters have stated that there are no other areas on the San Mateo County Coast that allows dog walking. Alternative E allows for the benefits of visitors to get exercise with their dogs. ROLAs should be allowed within New Lands specifically in Rancho Corral. Suggested areas include the beach from Tamarind St to Farrolone View School, or in the tract of land behind the Rancho stables. Designation of these areas should be considered based on sensitive habitat.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 449

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181813

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have read the GGNRA's plan for the Rancho Corral de Tierra area and feel that the best suited plan is alternative E. I truly feel that dogs who are under control, whether by voice or by leash, pose less a threat to the beautiful habitat we all enjoy than the horse riding community. In fact I am surprised to hear nothing about the impact that the Equestrians have on the trails.

Corr. ID: 477

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181818

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to strongly urge you to set aside an area of the Ranch Tierra land in Montara for off leash dog walking. Not all of it. Maybe the area from the beach to Tamarind St., behind Farralone View School.

Corr. ID: 1211

Organization: Montara Dog Group

Comment ID: 194858

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I prefer Alternative E as it relates to Rancho - Most of the dog walkers use a small area immediately north of Montara and east of Hwy 1, approx 1 square mile or slightly less, as well as a small area in El Granada to the east of Coral Reef Ave. Such a small area of Rancho, as well as just a tiny percentage of the Bay Area GGNRA lands, that has been used for off-leash walking for decades, by me personally for 20 years. If we could at least keep these small areas to enjoy, as there are really no other areas on the San Mateo County Coastside.

Corr. ID: 2906

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202669

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: For the past 7 years I have walked all of Montara Mountain with my dog, on and off leash. I have been a responsible dog owner, cleaning up after my dog, and having common sense as to when to have my dog on and off leash. I believe that if the Rancho Corral de Tierra lands are closed to dog owners then the Coastal residents will lose something very special.

I support Alternative E which states that "New Lands begin as 36 CFR 2.15 (dogs allowed on 6ft leash) and new lands with existing off leash use before acquisition may also be considered for voice and sight control in the future."

I hope that GGNRA takes into consideration that the Rancho Corral de Tierra lands have been used by the public for many years with few if any incidents regarding dogs. Restricting or removing dogs from the Rancho Corral de Tierra lands means that living here along the California Coast of San Mateo County is less because of GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3819 **Organization:** Montara Dog Group

Comment ID: 204903 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I live in montara and have been walking my dog in Rancho Corral de Tierra for the past ten years. 80% of the people walking in this area have dogs. In fact, many of the people without dogs are happy to see and pet other peoples dogs. We do not have a local park or rec center. Rancho is the one place people in Montara meet up, socialize and form a community. There is nowhere safe to walk my dog in Montara, other than Rancho. Walking in the neighborhood, requires walking in the street with cars going by. My 2 1/2 year old son loves to go on walks with our dog Max. If we had to walk in the street, he would miss out on that wonderful pastime.

I request that Alternative E (in the dog managment plan) be adopted for Rancho Corral de Tierra. Anything else, would adversely affect all the residents of Montara. Bike riders, horse back riders, walkers, runners and dog walkers have co-existed in harmony for many years. Please do not change what is working.

Corr. ID: 4601 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209947 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Area One is a tract bounded on the north by the Rancho stables and cultivated fields, on the west by the wetlands mandated as a part of the Devil's Slide Tunnel Project, and on the south and east by the unincorporated community of Montara. Area Two is the area accessed through Princeton-by-the-Sea a development within El Granada) and extending south and north behind that community.

Areas One and Two of Rancho constitute ideal locations for ROLAs under any objective criteria. The area is not pristine wilderness. Environmental impacts are minimal - the dogs have been in these areas for the past forty years. The ecosystem has adapted. The area is open so that dogwalkers may see and avoid any situations with the potential for conflict. The use is historical. The majority of users are dogwalkers.

Concern ID:

29389

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Alternative A is preferred. Current usage of New Lands (i.e., Rancho, Pacifica, Montara) including dog walking should continue to be allowed until scientific studies including long-term monitoring of site-specific conditions are done indicating that dog walking is harmful to park resources. Commenters believe that listed species have existed at the New Lands (Rancho Corral de Tierra) with dogs previously and that dog use of this area should be continued.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3129

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202012

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If there are any endangered plants or species in Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho) lands, they have survived half a century with hundreds of dogs using the area off leash. They are hearty enough to continue to survive with dogs continuing to use the area.

Corr. ID: 3129

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202005

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: GGNRA's preferred alternative for the Rancho is unfair and not truly multi-use. Marin and San Francisco have off-leash and on-leash areas for dogs, San Mateo is being given none.

I am requesting that the GGNRA's preferred alternative for New Lands, including Rancho, be changed from alternative D (No dogs allowed) to a "No Change" alternative.

Current usage of the land, including dog walking, should continue to be allowed until scientific studies are done indicating that dog walking is harmful to park resources.

A total ban on dogs is unacceptable. Creative multi-use solutions have not been considered. In Washington state, and Santa Cruz, CA, there are off-leash days, or off-leash hours in park areas. We are asking to continue to use approximately 100 acres with our dogs, out of 4200 acres.

Concern ID:

29390

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Alternative B is preferred. On-leash dog walking should be allowed in New Lands, specifically Rancho Corral. All dogs should be on-leash for safety concerns, regular enforcement of the leash law, and stronger restrictions on professional dog walkers. Off-leash dogs should not be allowed because they are a safety hazard and reduce some visitor's experience due to fear of off-leash dogs. Commenters also believe that off-leash dogs cause significant damage to trails, wildlife, and wildlife habitat.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 508

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181903

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is frustrating and sometimes scary to be put in these situations where dogs are loose and out of control, but I don't want to exclude dogs from Rancho Corral de Tierra entirely. It seems to me that the best compromise is to have all dogs on leashes to make it safer for all of us - other dog walkers, equestrians, kids, etc. and perhaps stronger restrictions on these "professional dog walkers" that have packs of dogs with them. 4-7 dogs on that many leashes with one person is still not safe since the person can easily be overpowered. It may also be necessary to have someone out there regularly enforcing the use of the leashes because many of these dog walkers will not comply.

Corr. ID: 1264

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194971

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Now, as I stated in the beginning, I am against the preferred plan (D) to ban dogs from Rancho Corral de Tierra. Off-leash dog use should continue to be allowed, as it has for decades. In the alternative, do not ban dogs, but allow them on-leash and consider off-leash use or an off-leash area.

Corr. ID: 3059

Organization: Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Comment ID: 201240

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do not agree with the New Lands prescription, which precludes dogs entirely from New Lands until opened in the Compendium. This puts the Park in a very difficult place when dealing with new communities. I propose that the Park approach the situation in a more realistic way to allow for the Park to make informed decisions without isolating entire communities. In new park

lands with unorganized tangles of trail systems, designating "trails" versus "social trails" takes time--let alone determining which designated trails should allow dogs and which shouldn't. Perhaps the language could read something like "Polygons shall be drawn inside new Park lands that designate where dogs are and are not allowed based on the current understanding of sensitive areas. In polygons allowing dogs, on-leash dogs shall be allowed on trail features within those trails, but not in any off trail areas within that polygon." This would be easier to sign and enforce, as many new sites have large numbers of redundant trails that are not worth signing independently AND allows for law enforcement officers and park users to understand which "trails" are allowed and are not.

Corr. ID: 3138 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 220191 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In addition, specifically for Rancho Corral de Tierra, a new land soon to be acquired by GGNRA, I strongly support on-leash dog walking ONLY. I hike regularly in this area and off leash dogs are a public safety hazard. On numerous occasions, I have nearly been attacked by off leash dogs. This is a very frightening experience and significantly interferes with my enjoyment of this beautiful land. As many dogs currently roam off leash on this property, the on-leash law will need to be strictly enforced once GGNRA begins to manage the land. I would not want to completely ban dogs from this property as many members of the dog walking community in this area do keep their dogs on leash and pick up after their dogs. However, in my 13 years of experience hiking in this area, voice control DOES NOT WORK for many dogs and should never be allowed on any of these lands. Aggressive dogs can cause significant safety hazards and limit the enjoyment of others who want to use the land without fear of being attacked by a dog. These off leash dogs also do significant damage to trails and foliage, scare and chase other natural animals in the habitat (birds, rabbits, etc) and generally create havoc in the entire natural environment.

NL1400 - New Lands: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29393

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Time Restrictions - Set up dog walking hours: dogs on-leash hours, dogs off-leash hours, and no dogs hours so that all visitors can share New Lands.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 543 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181970 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Re: Rancho Corral de Tierra - Draft Dog Management Plan....

...I strongly suggest the GGNRA come up with a shared solution, i.e., dog walking hours, dogs on leash hours, dogs off leash hours, people only; some creative way to share the beauty of the space and the opportunity for healthy exercise for those with dogs, without dogs, and new visitors.

Corr. ID: 1257 **Organization:** Montara Dogs

Comment ID: 194953 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A complete ban on dogs is obviously extreme and would cause riots and mass exoduses. But your preferred Option D is also extreme. I would like to respectfully request that Alternative E be your preferred alternative for new lands. Alternative E states that "New lands begin as 36 CFR 2.15 (dogs allowed on 6 ft leash) and new lands with existing off leash use before acquisition may also be considered for voice and sight control in the future." This alternative is much less restrictive than your current preferred alternative.

There is so much space (tons of acreage) in Rancho Corral de Tierra. I hope you will consider that the percentage where we wish to walk our dogs is actually infinitesimal. Please think about creative multi-use solutions. Areas specified for off-leash walking. Or morning and evening hours for off-leash walking.

Concern ID:

29395

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Education - The park should work with local animal welfare organizations, dog groups, and the community to ensure that dogs continue to have access to New Lands. Also to educate visitors about sensitive habitat areas which would help visitors to understand why their dogs should not be allowed in these areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3126

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201559

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The acquisition of open space should not automatically mean those areas are rendered off limits to us. The NPS should tap the commitment of dog owner groups to educate people about the environment and to be watch dogs for sensitive areas.

Corr. ID: 4452

Organization: San Francisco SPCA

Comment ID: 208469

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: In addition, not allowing any new lands to be available the dog owning community is simply unfair and unwarranted. We recommend the GGNRA work with and involve local animal welfare organizations, dog groups and the community to ensure that dog guardians continue to have access to these recreational park lands.

Concern ID:

29396

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Provide clearer rules, more signage, improved vegetative barriers, financial development, education, and outreach as part of an overall program for New Lands.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4472

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208707

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support a modified Alternative A (the "No Action alternative") and would also include the "New Lands" areas in San Mateo County. The current plan should be modified to provide clearer rules, more signage, improved vegetative barriers, financial development, education and outreach as part of the overall program.

Concern ID:

31334

CONCERN STATEMENT:

On new lands and particularly Rancho Corral, dogs should be allowed on currently available on-leash areas, and some off-leash areas should be provided. If the preferred alternative is chosen, a compendium should be issued stating that dogs will be allowed in certain areas.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4402

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204899

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I spoke with Superintendent Dean at the public forum in Pacifica, and understood him to say that he plans to issue a compendium allowing for areas of on-leash dogs soon after GGNRA controls the Rancho. He also stated that he is open to working with other organizations to establish an off-leash area. While I appreciate his stated intention, I would prefer that the initial Dog Management Plan be amended to allow for a more balanced alternative, allowing on-leash dogs in the areas that are currently frequently used by dogs and their owners, and allowing for off-leash areas as well. Should the preferred alternative become part of the final plan, I respectfully request that Mr. Dean immediately issue a compendium stating that dogs will be allowed in certain areas.

NL1500 - New Lands: Question Definition of New Lands

Concern ID: 29397
CONCERN STATEMENT: There is a concern that the plan for New Lands is inconsistent with the granting of new lands to the NPS; specifically to the definition of recreation.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2033 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193265 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: How is this plan consistent or inconsistent with the granting of lands to the NPS?

What is the definition of "recreation" as it was intended in the land grants to the NPS?

Concern ID: 29398
CONCERN STATEMENT: New Lands should be treated as existing lands. Commenters have stated that there is no support to treat New Lands differently.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4088 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208351 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: And I think that all of the sites in San Mateo County have not been adequately analyzed, as there is no legal basis for what you call "New Lands". These "New Lands" in San Mateo County (and Marin County too) should be treated as "existing lands". There is no case law or anything in the GGNRA's compendiums or the current GGNRA General Management Plan to support your conclusions about treating these lands differently.

Concern ID: 29399
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters have stated that the action to close New Lands to dog walking conflicts with the park's enabling legislation and with Management Policies (2006) for determining uses and land protection plans. The "closed until open" proposal would violate the park's statutory obligation to preserve and maintain recreational uses, violate sound land planning with the community, and violate NEPA by prejudging alternatives before site-specific and environmental review.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4089 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group
Comment ID: 208377 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 4. Improper Treatment of New Lands
The proposed action to close new lands to dog walking access conflicts with the GGNRA Enabling Legislation (PC 92-589) and with National Park Service Management Policies (2006) for determining uses and land protection plans. GGNRA is required to consider new lands in the same way that it considers uses and land protection measures on lands within GGNRA.
The unprecedented "Closed until open" proposal would violate GGNRA's statutory obligation to preserve and maintain recreational uses, violate sound land planning with the community, and violate NEPA by prejudging alternatives before site-specific public and environmental review. There is no basis for treating new lands differently than existing lands under NPS regulations and policies

Concern ID: 29400
CONCERN STATEMENT: The New Lands definition confuses the issues by blending areas which have neither environmental, ecological, historical, or recreational uses in common (i.e., portions of Marin and coastal San Mateo County).
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4601 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209942 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: None of the "data" offered in support of the GGNRA's position is specifically relevant to the "New Lands", as defined in the DMP/EIS.

The "New Lands" definition itself is designed to obfuscate the issues by amalgamating areas which have neither environment, ecology, history, or recreational uses in common - i.e. portions of Marin and coastal San Mateo County.

OB1100 - Ocean Beach: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29342

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The preferred plan at Ocean Beach provides adequate space for both users who appreciate dogs, and those who are looking for a no dog experience. Commenters supported the preferred plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 265 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180856 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think the park service has shown great sensitivity to the many competing needs and interests at Ocean Beach. The preferred alternative plan allowing dogs off leash on the northern end of the park, and then allowing for an area with no dogs further south appears to strike a good balance. Although it might mean that people who live further south would have to walk or drive their dogs the short hop up to the northern parking lot they would retain a great nearby place to play and enjoy, while allowing for some much needed dog free zones.

Corr. ID: 1962 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200348 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the Dog Management Plan to the extent that it further restricts off-leash dog use in San Francisco, specifically Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, and Fort Funston. I agree that the current situation is totally unsustainable, and more intensive and thoughtful management is necessary to preserve and maintain the endangered species and recreational benefits of these parks for all park users

Concern ID: 29343

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The preferred alternative is desirable, as it protects the Snowy Plover and other wildlife from off-leash dog interactions.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1783 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200261 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Today at Ocean beach in San Francisco (between Pacheco and Sloat Boulevard in the Sunset Diestric) I sadly watched unleashed dogs chasing birds. I am glad the GGNRA is working so hard to correct this problem and protect wildlife from thoughtless dog owners.

Corr. ID: 2042 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200539 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Ocean Beach, I think your preferred option is reasonable, and balances wildlife protection with recreational opportunities.

Corr. ID: 2331 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201962 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I wholly endorse your plan to strictly limit off-leash dogs as this seems to be the only viable means to protect the Snowy Plover [at Ocean Beach] and other birds, meet the needs of many beachwalkers who do not appreciate a dog knocking them over, and still provide a large area for off leash use.

Corr. ID: 3585 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203664 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very supportive of the Draft EIS for the GGNRA Dog Management Plan, which I think recommends as the preferred alternative a nice mix of on-leash, off-leash, and no-dog areas and a clear description and enforcement of dog rules, which is what the National Park Service is proposing. I have read through the executive summary of the EIS and looked at the maps and am very supportive of the preferred alternative that the National Park Service analyzed. As the mom of two young children, I love the idea of having clear dog regulations that are actually enforced and a mix of off-leash, on-leash, and areas where dogs are not allowed.

In particular, having areas at Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Baker Beach where we can picnic, walk, and relax with kids without worrying about off-leash dogs is very appealing to me. In particular, I am very supportive of having areas at Ocean Beach (Snowy Plover Protection Area), Baker Beach (North Beach), and Crissy Field (Wildlife Protection Area and East Beach) where we can recreate with young children in an area with no dogs. I am also supportive of having areas where dogs would be on-leash (the trails at Fort Funston, portions of Crissy Field Air Field and Promenade, Fort Point trails, Coastal Trail at Ocean Beach, and Baker Beach South Beach and trails). There are still large areas where off-leash dogs would be allowed, including the northern end of Ocean Beach, a large portion of the Crissy Air Field and much of Crissy Field Beach, and the beach and a large area north of the parking lot at Fort Funston. I think the National Park Service has proposed a very nice compromise between on-leash, off-leash, and no-dog areas within GGNRA lands in San Francisco.

OB1200 - Ocean Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29344

***CONCERN
STATEMENT:***

It is unfair to implement these restrictions, as there has not been any concrete evidence or reason to justify the change in policy. Commenters felt that other activities and user groups were likely to be significantly contributing to problems, and the impacts of dogs were overblown. Other impacts would include accessibility and management impacts as a result of the plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 822 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186100 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am deeply opposed to the "Preferred Alternative Plan for Ocean Beach"

The amount of dog walkers walking to the beach from the Sunset and Parkside neighborhoods is very high. On weekday mornings 25-50% of the beach traffic comes from these folks. If the preferred plan goes into effect, all of these people will now get into their cars and drive to the North end of the beach. The plan does not account for the increased vehicle traffic and parking requirements this will cause. Not to mention the increase in vehicle related pollution.

The preferred plan limits dogs to the "Coastal Trail". This trail is not maintained nor is it contiguous. There is nothing in the plan or in the history of GGNRA management of Ocean Beach that makes me confident that the GGNRA has the resources to maintain this trail. For this reason I believe that the "Coastal Trail" should not be a part of the plan, making the Preferred Alternative not feasible. Other possible stressors to the Snowy Plover have not been addressed. For example vehicles, motorcycle, horses, heavy sand moving equipment, litter, surface street runoff, construction spoils from the last century, dune erosion and non-indigenous species. I say fix all of the above before focusing on the dogs.

Corr. ID: 2884 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202916 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a dog owner who has been walking Ocean Beach from Taraval to the Cliff House every day for the past 15 years. There are very few problems with dogs on the beach

You have mischaracterized the issue - Ocean Beach is a very harsh environment - there are only a limited number of people and dogs on the beach when I go out there around sunset. Interestingly, when the "snowy plover" season has its 6 week window of not appearing - there are not any more dogs or people on the beach. Only a few people avail themselves of this wonderful resource - it is by no means overrun or inundated by dogs, even in this period.

I would like to add that you have royally given our wonderful pets a reputation they don't deserve - and they deserve to run this beach in all their glory - and with very little impact to the shorebirds - just as its human companions. The amount of joy and exuberance that you are denying is very hurtful to our magnificent companions. Please see that major parts of Ocean Beach are still designated as off leash areas - this is nature conservancy at its best.

Corr. ID: 3477 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203322 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This is a very poorly thought out and unfair plan, that does not properly balance the allocation of resources to the constituent users. The current regulations address most of the complaints re dogs and should be enforced; there is no need to exclude properly supervised dogs off leash on most of Ocean beach, particularly when most of concerns stem from excessive and inappropriate human usage, i.e. alcohol, graffiti, drugs, bonfires, trash, etc. There are no convincing peer reviewed scientific data that these regulations are necessary for protection of habitat or wildlife and the solutions are draconian. One can be sure that there will be no accommodation even if, in 5 years, there is no improvement in any outcome measures. Cramming all the dogs and handlers into a small area will only lead to more problems of a different nature.

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

29345

The preferred alternative would negatively impact dog owners who rely on the site. Many dog walkers would not have another option for dog walking if this alternative is implemented.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 780 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190026 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach has long been a bastion for dog owners in the city, many of which have acquired particular species of dogs (that require extensive exercise) with the availability of Ocean Beach and other areas within the GGNRA in mind. It is impossible to effectively exercise many species of dogs without giving them access to large spaces in which they can run off leash. Imposing a leash requirement is akin to banning dogs outright, insomuch as the reason that most dog owners take their dogs to the beach is so that they can get exercise (leash = no exercise). To now restrict access to these places will adversely affect the health of the a large number of dogs in the region which will in turn also negatively affect their owners. It does seem unreasonable to make such a drastic change in the rules at a time when so many residents have come to depend on being able to exercise their dogs within this area. There are countless options for visitors who would prefer to not encounter dogs.

Corr. ID: 780 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190025 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In terms of prohibiting off-leash dogs in the GGNRA on

account of wishing to respect the interests of those visitors that do not like dogs and do not wish to encounter them within the area, I am confused as to why this minority interest should supersede that of the majority. Ocean Beach stands out as one of only a few public beaches in the entire state that do allow dogs to roam off-leash, which means that those not wishing to encounter dogs have numerous alternatives to visiting Ocean Beach, whereas the same cannot be said for dog owners, who have no other options for letting their dogs run freely and get the exercise they need (Note: fenced in off-leash dog park (crap piles), do not provide either the space or the terrain required).

Corr. ID: 3950 **Organization:** resident of San Francisco

Comment ID: 206026 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: This Dog Management Plan assumes that millions of dogs are invading/threatening Ocean Beach and therefore must be prohibited. This is totally false. In reality, there are very few of us on the beach regularly. The weather and surface conditions are not inviting to most people. Only on exceptionally warm days (which are rare) is it crowded. GGNRA needs to understand that Ocean Beach is the western edge of a very dense urban city.

All the GGNRA's inflated concern is invented. There are no more people with dogs now than there were twenty years ago. Ocean Beach is as wild and wonderful as it always has been and I want to maintain that. This draconian GGNRA plan is so suspect and potentially so damaging to those of us who live here.

Corr. ID: 4585 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210015 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Safety

As a woman who often walks alone with her dog, I find Ocean Beach invaluable. To me, it is a singular location in the city of San Francisco not only due to its beauty, but because the 3.5 mile round trip between Sloat and Judah is flat, free of traffic, and where, with my dog, I feel safe to walk alone. Losing the ability to walk on Ocean Beach with my dog would be an immeasurable loss to me. Without my dog, I would not feel free to walk Ocean Beach.

Not only does my own dog make me feel safer, but other people walking dogs makes me feel safer. The stretch of Ocean Beach between Sloat and Judah is little used, and without the people with dogs, there would hardly be anyone left. I would feel too removed from civilization to feel safe walking alone.

Many who use this part of Ocean Beach are dog owners, and I've noticed that many are women walking alone with their dogs, like me. I did not see anything in the EIS that considered who the current users are and who would be affected by the ban of dogs from Ocean Beach, so I wanted to provide this data point.

Restriction to the Coastal Trail, as proposed in Alternative C, is not a comparable experience. The trail's proximity to 35 mph traffic, the occasional camper in the dunes, and its distance from shore and shorebirds, makes it less safe, beautiful, and peaceful.

Concern ID:

29346

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters opposed the plan because they did not support banning dogs on Ocean Beach south of Sloat Boulevard and/or in the SPPA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181130 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I object to any effort to restrict off-leash access to any part

of Ocean Beach from the Cliff House south as far as Ulloa Street, at least, unless a specific area has been identified as sensitive wildlife habitat. As far as I am aware, no such area exists. I can conceive of no rational reason to limit access along this stretch of beach solely to on-leash dogs. There appear to be no environmental bases for such a limitation, and there certainly are no fragile resources of any cultural significance in this area.

Corr. ID: 557

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182030

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: So, I must request, that you NOT CHANGE any of the dog policies regarding Ocean Beach or what you call the Snowy Plover Protection area. This is an urban area of your park. As such dog owners have the right and the obligation to exercise their dogs in such an area. Your efforts to further restrict dog management policies to disallow dogs, or disallow off leash areas would challenge that basic right and be harmful to both individuals and our animals. Please dont do it.

There are plenty of places where the plovers can go to do whatever it is they do, or where individuals who have problems with on leash dogs can go

Corr. ID: 986

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191696

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'll start by saying that I strongly protest banning dogs from the SPPA at Ocean Beach. I spend 2007-2010 working as an ecological risk assessor for a Bay Area environmental consulting firm... I am very familiar with the process required to create an EIS, and I am disappointed with the negligence the NPS has exhibited with this particular effort. ...and I feel like the shorebird "situation" on the beach has been grossly misrepresented by the NPS. There's at least 50 people that use Ocean Beach to every dog out there...yet you choose to blame the dogs. Again, I will say this is negligent and disappointing coming from the NPS.

For those of us who have well-behaved canines and moved out to the beach to join a outdoor-loving community of like-minded people, I again want to reiterate that I strongly protest banning dogs from the SPPA.

Corr. ID: 1186

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193564

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Banning dogs from Ocean Beach is unrealistic and will only cause more problems. You will be punishing the people who use the beach the most.

Corr. ID: 2900

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201195

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In our experience, Ocean Beach has always been about dogs and people. It's a recreation area and to ban dogs on the beach between Stairwell 21 and Sloat Boulevard feels particularly draconian. Instead of making significant changes to the current regulations it would be more appropriate to enforce those that do exist

Concern ID:

29347

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The restrictions of dogs in the SPPA and creation of a ROLA north of stairwell 21 would crowd user groups into one area, which would cause more interactions and incidents between dog walkers, children, tourists, and those who did not like dogs. The ROLA location is also problematic as it is too close to the SPPA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1608

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190848

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: By closing off the majority of Ocean Beach to all dogs, you are crowding every dog into the section of Ocean Beach used by families and children. Tourists see this one section of beach, which will be overrun with dogs, while the rest of the beach is empty. This does not make sense.

Corr. ID: 1774 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191570 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed Regulated Off-Leash Dog Area at Ocean Beach is problematic due to its adjacency to a western snowy plover area.

Concern ID: 29348

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters were opposed to attempts to fence in off-leash dogs, remove the off-leash areas, or require them to be on-leash everywhere at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1140 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192485 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not stop the off-leash area at Fort Funston and Ocean. Dogs need to run.

Keep off-leash.

Corr. ID: 2828 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201132 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I disagree with attempts to require off-leash dog areas to be fenced in. I think it's unfeasible and really does not take into account the needs of dogs and dog owners in the Bay Area.

I also disagree with requiring dogs to be on-leash at Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Fort Funston, etc.

Yes, we should protect the GGNRA, but we also need to protect the ability of San Francisco dog owners to have ample open spaces to let our dogs exercise off-leash.

Corr. ID: 3327 **Organization:** NPCA

Comment ID: 202941 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: After looking into the argument about dogs on Ocean Beach in respect to the effect it has on the snowy plover, I found that the mass movement of sand in the middle section of ocean beach (near Pacheco), by use of tractors allowed by the Park offices I presume has been more detrimental to the snowy plover's environment than any off-leash dog activity.

Obviously human traffic, unleashed dogs do still have an effect on this bird that nests in these dunes and low-lying banks of sand, but to hold them solely responsible

is and seems very irresponsible by people who should know better. Such people should focus on the greater threats to the snowy plover.

Having dogs on-leash on Ocean Beach near the areas of plovers nesting is a sound idea, but to have to leash a dog at all parts of the beach is unacceptable to me as a dog owner. After all, this is parks and recreation.

Concern ID: 31825

CONCERN STATEMENT: Having only one ROLA at Ocean Beach would make it difficult for visitors who live at the southern end of the beach and sunset to visit these areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1661 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191060 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach- Why not 2 areas for off leash!! If I live by the 200 it would be a hardship to come all the way to the cliff house area without a car!

Corr. ID: 1692

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191096

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel that the Ocean Beach issue is unrealisti - there is no evidence that the birds are undully disturbed by people or dogs - the vehicles may tho- it is denying the residents that live in the Sunset the ability to use the beach - if the birds were nesting there it would be different.

OB1300 - Ocean Beach: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID:

29349

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Alternative E provides good protection to visitors and the environment at Ocean Beach, and should be the alternative chosen for this site.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 408

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181574

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To protect the environment and pedestrians like me, please enforce leash requirements on Ocean Beach as described in the Preferred Alternative or Alternative E. Thank you.

Corr. ID: 1521

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190685

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach

Plan E is the only reasonable compromise. Then enforce it -- and fine people who break the law.

However, it seems to me that the current plan is restrictive enough + requires no additional restrictions.

Corr. ID: 4585

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210009

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We are very disappointed that the GGNRA prefers Alternative C, which would prohibit dogs from Ocean Beach south of Stairwell 21.

We support the year-round leash law proposed in Alternative E, which would protect the habitat and migrating shorebirds, and allow responsible dog owners to continue to use Ocean Beach.

Concern ID:

29350

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Alternative D would be the most beneficial alternative, as commenters did not support any voice control, and felt that this option would provide snowy plovers more opportunity for successful nesting seasons.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1544

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190728

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach

No dogs on walkways, on beaches with possible exception for northern end at strwell 21

Voice control anywehre is a NO-NO

Prefer 15D but can live w/15C

Corr. ID: 3701 **Organization:** Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
Comment ID: 202229 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Impacts to Listed Species

We were disappointed that you did not more fully emphasize the Lafferty studies at Sands Beach, Coal Oil Point Reserve in Santa Barbara, California. This study demonstrated that human recreation on beaches and particularly off-leash dogs pose a significant problem for the viability of nesting snowy plovers. In fact, no snowy plovers had successfully fledged on this beach for 30 years. A management regime that included a physical boundary around a proposed nesting area and the prohibition of off-leash dogs resulted in the success of snowy plover nesting after initiation of that regime.

Thus, in determining appropriate levels of dog use in GGNRA particular attention must be paid to those areas that provide listed species habitat. Ocean Beach and Crissy Field are two areas that support the listed Western snowy plover. The Lafferty research demonstrates that with a significant reduction in disturbance, especially from off-leash dogs, snowy plovers can successfully nest on these beaches and thus increase the total snowy plover population. We believe that it is incumbent upon the NPS to implement such management regimes at these two sites, and any others that support listed species, in order to comply with the federal ESA obligations cited above.

This would entail the prohibition of off-leash dogs on Ocean beach and Crissy Field. Alternative C does provide for some of this protection but we believe it is inadequate. Alternative D would provide the greatest opportunity for the Western snowy plover to have successful nesting seasons at these beaches, and others in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 4315 **Organization:** State of California Department of Fish and Game
Comment ID: 209392 **Organization Type:** State Government

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach

The NPS Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) differs from the Environmentally Preferable Alternative in the designation of a ROLA on the beach north of Stairwell 21. Under Alternative D, dogs would be required to be leashed in this area. As stated in the draft EIS, the adoption of Alternative C at this site is likely to result in minor adverse impacts to beach vegetation, long-term moderate adverse effects on shorebirds, gulls, and terns and marine mammals, and potentially limit use of preferred habitat by the federally threatened western snowy plover. DFG recommends that Alternative D be selected as the adopted alternative, as it, by requiring dogs to be leashed north of Stairwell 21, would avoid impacts to birds which may result from repeated flushing; impacts to marine mammals which may result from biting, barking, or physical contact; and impacts to snowy plover which may result from harassment.

Concern ID: 29351

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The chosen alternative should have dogs off the beach during the nesting season for birds, but allow them on the rest of the year, as is consistent with alternative A. The current restrictions should be continued.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 907 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 191279 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge you to maintain Fort Funston and Ocean Beach as off-leash dog parks. They have been used as such for many years and have come to be relied upon by dog owners, such as myself for our use and enjoyment. There are

already plenty of parks where off-leash is not allowed and not an option and personally, I am fine with this. Please leave things status quo.

Corr. ID: 1565

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190768

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach: NO CHANGE to current laws

This exemplifies compromise, as there are clear barriers for on leash and off-leash activity. People who do not want to be near dogs that are off leash can visit other areas that are restricted. People with dogs can enjoy off leash activity in a very small area.

Focus on enforcement fo current law rather than changing it. I am on the beach every day, 2x a day, and I rarely see park rangers.

Corr. ID: 2230

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200846

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am requesting that the GGNRA adopt the 1979 Pet Policy to control off-leash dog walking on Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, and Crissy Field because it is more balanced, longstanding, supports recreation, collaboration and shared use.

Corr. ID: 2255

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201014

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A good comparison is the part of the plan that keeps dogs off of Ocean Beach when birds need it for nesting and not the rest of the year--- sharing fairly.

Concern ID:

31803

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support alternative B for Ocean Beach. Dogs should be kept on-leash as off-leash dogs can be dangerous and casue safety issues.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2087

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200519

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge you to require all dogs on Ocean Beach be kept on leash at all times. Voice control has proven not to be effective.

I have run and walked on Ocean Beach for over 40 years. In recent years there have been an increased number of unleashed dogs on the beach. I have been bitten by an unleashed dog while running on Ocean Beach. When running with friends who have a dog on leash, their dogs have been attacked by unleashed dogs. Each of these behaviors is natural of dogs. By their very nature and breeding, they attack running prey, in this case me. A leashed dog appears to be in a weakened position and is fair game for an unrestrained dog.

Often the owners of unleashed dogs are hostile when I ask them to control their dog. When I ask them to restrain their dog, they are often openly hostile. I have been called crazy, cursed at, and given the "finger".

I should not have to take a subservient position to dogs. They should all be required to be on leash, not just voice control, while on Ocean Beach

Corr. ID: 2468

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200800

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please, don't allow dogs to run free on Ocean Beach!

Concern ID: 29352

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Fencing - The use of fencing around ROLAs should be implemented at Ocean Beach to ensure that dogs remain inside the ROLA. Suggestions included placing a fence along the south border of the ROLA from the sea wall to the plover sculpture. Fences or barriers should also be placed around Snowy Plover Protection Area, specifically around plover nests in the dunes and also along the cliff.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2905

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202642

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach - I support the Preferred Alternative for Ocean Beach. To improve upon the Preferred Alternative, I suggest using symbolic fencing and adequate signage to delineate the south border of the ROLA. A simple post and cable fence could be placed along the border from the sea wall to the plover sculpture. A well defined border will help to reduce compliance problems and visitor conflict. Additionally, I suggest changing the name "Snowy Plover Protection Area" to "Wildlife Protection Area". A designation of Wildlife Protection Area would be inclusive of all wildlife species that use the beach habitat area.

Corr. ID: 3112

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201520

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have reviewed the proposed restrictions for Ocean Beach, and find them draconian. It is an enormous beach that is largely unused most days of the year, and it seems to me to be an overreach to shut practically the entire beach down to off leash dogs. I am in favor of protecting the plover, but as I understand it, the real issue is protecting their nests in the dunes. If that is indeed the case, why don't you just cordon off the dunes, or restrict access to that part of the beach? I think most people who want to have their dogs off leash mostly want to do so along the tideline so that their dogs can swim.

Corr. ID: 3701

Organization: Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Comment ID: 220539

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Barriers around ROLAs.

The Lafferty study was quite clear that signage alone was inadequate to instill public compliance with a prohibited access area. On the other hand, a minimal fence in combination with a docent program was quite successful. The minimal fence alone was also inadequate, although better than the signage alone. This demonstrates that the management regime for ROLAs proposed in all alternatives is doomed to failure. Without a physical barrier and some human presence, be it educational docents or enforcement staff, the boundaries of a signed-only ROLA will be ignored. (We argue that since a barrier and docent were necessary to keep off-leash dogs out of an area, it is likewise necessary to have barriers and docents to keep off-leash dogs in a ROLA.)

Corr. ID: 4432

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208587

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe the cliff and Snowy Plover areas should be fenced off and feature prominent and highly visible signage to keep people and dogs out of there.

Concern ID: 29353

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Enforcement - An alternative for Ocean Beach must include high levels of enforcement if it is to be successful. Better enforcement would help to prevent confusion about the current rules, and would improve the situation under all of the alternatives.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1680

Organization: member of public

Comment ID: 200272 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My main point is this: Dog owners have alternatives as to where to walk their dogs. The local wildlife does not have alternatives-the beach is their home.

This is a simple but powerful argument because it is true. Most dog owners can choose where to walk their pets. Snowy plovers, common mures and other endangered birds do not have a choice. The beach is their home. Sea mammals also live there and are also affected by the waste dogs produce. Our enjoyment of the area is not necessary; our best efforts in preserving their home is.

The entire eco-system on Ocean Beach is already under pressure from the phenomenal amount of oil that can be found on the beach on most days. The amount of plastic on the beach is also heart-breaking. I walked there today and in five minutes had more plastic waste with me than I could carry. It does not make sense to deliberately create an environment which makes sustaining wildlife more difficult than it already is.

The birds are continuously being harrassed by unleashed dogs at Ocean Beach in the protected areas. I would contend that increased limitations on access is needed but THEY MUST BE ENFORCED diligently. Please step up enforcement of all regulations throughout the beach, not just in the parking lots. I see empty alcohol bottles regularly and under-aged drinking often. An un-enforced law or regulation promotes disdain for law in general and is counterproductive.

I saw today alone in 15 minutes over 10 different dogs off leash in the protected area. I remind folks that dogs should be on leash; this is not always well received. It seems like fining first or repeat offenders could easily generate enough revenue to pay for further law enforcement.

Corr. ID: 2924 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203398 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I can only speak to the part of the plan that relates to Ocean Beach as that is my neighborhood. I would have no problem with the current seasonal restrictions if they were enforced and people followed them, but they are not. It is rare to see dogs on leash in the designated area during snowy plover nesting season and most of the dogs running around are not voice controlled and many chase after the birds, I have even witnessed dogs catching snowy plovers and killing them a couple times.

Most dog owners either do not see the poor signage and are not aware of the seasonal leash law or intentionally ignore it, and are rude and entitled in their response if you nicely mention the law to them and the reasons for it.

I have only twice seen people patrolling the beach informing dog owners they need to have dogs on leash in the year and a half I've lived there, this is obviously not sufficient and dog owners should be fined if they do not comply, otherwise what's the point of having the law at all. Making the on leash area a permanent rather than seasonal law will not help this issue if it is not stringently enforced and better marked. Therefore I would recommend leaving the current seasonal law in place with more active enforcement and signage, including signage posted at all the beach access points along great highway as well as posted along the beach at regular intervals. That is what is needed.

Restrictions on dog walking and off leash areas are not going to be effective if they are not being enforced and there is no incentive for dog walkers/owners to follow

them (or deterrent against breaking them,) this is as true of the current restrictions as it is of potentially more stringent ones. I suspect you will find that increasing many of these restrictions in the GGNRA is not what is needed, what is necessary is enforcement of the existing ones.

Concern ID:

29354

CONCERN STATEMENT:

ROLA - There should be a large area left for off-leash dog walking at Ocean Beach, and/or the entire beach should be off-leash as it is currently. Suggestions for off-leash areas included the Great Highway dune and beach area, area south of Sloat Boulevard, north of stairwell 21, and through parts of the area that is currently the SPPA between Lincoln and Sloat Boulevard.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 663

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182589

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like the Great Hwy dunes area open for off leash walking. The May-July off leash allowance seems unnecessary (what are the statistics of the snowy plover recovery??- I have never seen one)

. What I do wonder is why the Ocean Beach area by the Cliff House is an off leash area. That is the area where people park and enjoy the beach. The area between Lincoln & Sloat is not as populated with people w/o dogs. Why not make that area off leash? That way the open beach can be used by folks w/o dogs. If you allow voice control along the Great Hwy, that would be a good thing.

Corr. ID: 949

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191532

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I live along the Great Hwy and feel dogs should be on a leash along the path - but truly feel there is no need for leashes on the dunes or on the beach.

Corr. ID: 1585

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190810

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Re: Ocean Beach - preferred alternative: Dogs and their owners should be allowed off-leash south of Sloat Blvd to Ft. Funston. This area is sparsely used by beach-goers and the bluffs are crumbling away & subject to much man-made intervention (rip rap-concrete, etc) to shore up the cliff. Further south the cliff swallows are up on the cliffs, not on the beach, so dogs do not disturb them. I believe this area is not populated by snowy plovers, and I doubt dogs could cause more destruction of the species than man has.

Corr. ID: 1682

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191080

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please allow Ocean Beach to be the recreational playground for "our best friends" - at the very minimum - allow the stretch from Lincoln to the Cliff House to be off leash friendly.

Corr. ID: 2005

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193208

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Area available for off leash dogs at Ocean Beach should be more than just north of stairwell 21. This area is too small.

Concern ID:

29355

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Time Restrictions - Time-of-day use restrictions and seasonal restrictions would be a beneficial system for accommodating different user groups at Ocean Beach. Suggestions included restricting dog walking on Ocean Beach during the summer months and allowing off-leash dog walking on the beach in the morning hours.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1663

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191062

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: What about -->

- Making one of the sites like Ft Funston be a destination "center of excellence" of dog mgmt. Bring in corporate america to help run in like curry village with 41 Billion spent on pets we can find someone.

-Create time restrictions in densely populated areas like Chrissy Field - weekends before 9 after 4.

restrict Ocean Beach during the summer time - have it people only like dog beach in San Diego.

With signs and clear rules "enforcement" will be just as difficult or easy as the current proposals.

Corr. ID: 3115

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201524

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think that for Ocean Beach and Crissy Field a great compromise could be the time of day. I know there are a lot of children and/or people who are afraid of dogs. They deserve to enjoy the parks too. But if you have a dog at the beach at 7am who cares? The dogs actually help keep the area safe. I have been there at 6:30 in the morning when it is so beautiful and quite, along side other caring dog owners and the joggers, only to find a few partiers or homeless on the beach. Maybe having the beaches off leash before 11am would be a solution?

Corr. ID: 3921

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205718

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Make Ocean Beach seasonal or timed access. Either open to off leash Nov - May or before 10am. The weather is what dictates visitors at this beach.

Concern ID:

29356

CONCERN STATEMENT:

[On-Leash - Commenters suggested having on-leash dog walking available on North Ocean Beach from the Cliff House to the dunes, all along the dunes, south of Sloat Blvd, and north of Stairwell 21 due to visitor congestion and wildlife protection.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 417

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181590

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach (proposed Alternative C): The current proposal requires dogs on leash throughout all of Ocean Beach, except south of Sloat where they're banned. Instead, I'd suggest North Ocean Beach (from the Cliff House to the dunes) require dogs be on leash, as this is the highest traffic area of the beach, and the most likley destination for tourists. The area along the dunes, which is less traveled, should be designated as off-leash. Again, it would effectively encourage dog owners to use that portion instead. South of Sloat should require dogs be leashed, perhaps banned during mating season (but only during mating season).

Corr. ID: 781

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 185830

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please restrict dogs to on-leash only North of Stairwell 21 at Ocean Beach.

Concern ID:

29357

CONCERN STATEMENT:

[The Park Service should try to find a way to work with aggressive dogs, rather than limiting all off-leash dog activity in beach areas, including Ocean Beach.](#)

For representative quotes pleas refer to Concern Statement 29302 (FB1200), Comment 191699

Concern ID: 29358

CONCERN STATEMENT:

No Dogs - Commenters suggested that dogs should not be allowed to run off-leash, or alternately that they should not be allowed at Ocean Beach at all. Suggestions for no dog areas included south of the Cliff House, north of the beach chalet (Stairwell 19), or the entire beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 650

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181458

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I see them frequently chasing the birds, including the Snowy Plover. I sometimes ask owners whose dogs I see chasing the Plover if they are aware of the restriction and they always answer "yes". These owners knowingly disregard this restriction. I believe this occurs so frequently because this law is not adequately enforced.

I feel that protecting the Snowy Plover is more important than allowing dog owners to run their dogs unleashed. I hope that the GGNRA will give dog owners notice that if they continue to disregard the law, dogs will be entirely prohibited on Ocean Beach.

Corr. ID: 1626

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190934

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you wish to have an area for access by people without any presence of dogs at all, I recommend the area just south of the Cliff house and north of the beach Chalet (@ Stairwell 19) as such area is clearly seperable and more frequently visited by tourists.

In no case should the GGNRA block off the ability of the park users with dogs to take a long beach walk from the stairwell 21 anex south to the around Sloat.

Corr. ID: 3852

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209321

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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 occurs. 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.

Corr. ID: 4269

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209095

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I completely support placing tighter restrictions on dogs using Golden Gate National Recreation Areas. I believe they are needed to protect the snowy plover and all wildlife in these areas. Dogs should be kept out of parts of San Francisco's Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, and I agree with Michael Lynes that the proposed rules don't go far enough.

Corr. ID: 4659

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209067

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As to Ocean Beach, I have long thought that it would be

appropriate to have some small area where there are no dogs at all to accommodate park visitors who want a beach experience but are fearful of dogs. I think the far north most part of Ocean Beach near the Cliff House would be the logical place to have an off limits area of around 100 yards. That would accommodate the interest without breaking up the continuity of the cherished experience of taking a long hike or run on the remainder of the beach.

Concern ID:

29360

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Signage - The areas designated as off-leash or on-leash need better signage. Many commenters expressed experiences of being confused at what areas are currently open to off-leash dogs, and felt this would be a problem in the future without adequate signage.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 972

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191659

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There has to be some beach for dogs to run free. I purpose part of Ocean Beach, and have it CLEARLY marked. Same with Stinson Beach and Crissy Field.

Corr. ID: 2022

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193235

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach should have some sign or marker along beach (not just at stairwell) indicating boundary between on-leash & off-leash areas

Corr. ID: 3157

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202885

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Ocean Beach, please mark Stairway 21 more clearly. We have no idea at all where it's located.

Concern ID:

31866

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Ocean Beach should not be closed year-round to dogs on- and off-leash for protection of the snowy plover. The beach should be open to dogs when the plovers are not present, and should be on-leash only during the times when they are.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 115

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181990

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I for one am confused on the rational for suggesting all of Ocean Beach should be closed to dogs on and off leash. If the rational is to protect the snowy plover, why then is the beach not open in the summer months when the snowy plover is gone? Also, why not just keep it as is as an on leash only area during the months the bird is around?

OVI100 - Oakwood Valley: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID:

29233

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support the leash restrictions for Alternative C at Oakwood Valley which includes the construction of double gates enclosing the ROLA on Oakwood Trail Fire Road. Commenters also support leash restrictions on Oakwood Valley Trail because dog walkers will still have use of the parallel Oakwood Valley Fire Road.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1811

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191793

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I hope that people will be able to continue walking their dogs, off leash, on the Oakwood Trail Fire Road, on Tennessee Valley Road in Mill Valley.

It is one of the few places left for me to take our dogs. I am 79 years old, with arthritic hips, which cause me to have poor balance. - Leash dog walking is difficult for me.

Corr. ID: 4111

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208487

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to enthusiastically support leash restrictions on Alta Trail from Marin City to Oakwood Valley Trail.

As someone who lives near the entrance to Alta, my family and I are always surrounded by dogs off-leash as we try to walk or jog along the trail.

The trail is often used by 'professional' dog-walkers, who take many off-leash dogs of various sizes on the trail, without any voice control. Many of these dogs are intimidating types of dogs.

Corr. ID: 4215

Organization: San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208893

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Oakwood Valley Trail and Fire Road, Alta Trail, Orchard Fire Road and Pacheco Fire Road - We support the Preferred Alternative treatment of Oakwood Valley Trail and Oakwood Valley Fire Road, with the construction of double gates enclosing the ROLA. We prefer the Alternative D treatment of the Alta Trail, Orchard Fire Road and Pacheco Fire Road because of habitat concerns. If sufficient means can be found to protect the Mission Blue butterfly habitat along these trails, we would find the Preferred Alternative acceptable.

OV1200 - Oakwood Valley: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID:

29234

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose the preferred alternative which includes closing parts of Oakwood Valley to dogs and losing off-leash areas at this site. Commenters feel that the visitor experience would be degraded since the current dog walking loop at the site would be taken away. Visitors feel that this action is unnecessary since dogs have not been an issue on these trails/roads

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1072

Organization: Dog-Loving Human Being, Planet Earth

Comment ID: 192199

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I STRONGLY OBJECT to Map 4 Oakwood Valley and Alta Trail's "Preferred Alternative." It's almost worse than closing the entire area to dogs (which you seem to want to do on Map 4-D). In your "Preferred Alternative" dogs are on-leash for the whole of the Alta Trail from Donahue to the new gate! This is a horrible idea! There is no reason whatsoever to require a leash on the Alta! None!

The second part of this plan is even worse. The Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Valley Trail form a perfect leafy, shade-and-sun, peaceful forty minute loop walk for my dog and myself, yet you want to ban dogs completely from the best part of this walk--the Valley Trail. Once again, why?

Corr. ID: 1339

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195135

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Oakwood Valley

The preferred alternative is far too restrictive. This has recently been a daily walk for us. To limit this trail to on-leash or eliminate dogs entirely would eliminate 80% of the current use of this space since there are so few areas to bring dogs to begin with.

Corr. ID: 3215

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202564

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My specific knowledge is with the Oakwood Valley area in Marin. I have been walking my dogs there for 25 years. In that time, I have only seen one negative dog/human interaction and it was with a young owner and a pitbull mix that was out of control. While this was an unnecessary and unfortunate occurrence, it was also a rare one. We should not punish everyone for the very rare, but poor choices occasionally made by a few individuals. While some people may wish to walk in areas without dogs, the overwhelming majority of trails and areas in the GGNRA are, and still will be, off limits to dogs. Tennessee Valley, for instance, just up the road from Oakwood Valley, encompasses a very large tract of land with many trails, all but one of which is off limits to dogs.

One thing I would like to add here is that creating dog walking loops of trails is generally better for both the humans and dogs than a short out and back trail. In Oakwood Valley we have enjoyed several loops from the Crest Marin neighborhood (Birdland) access points. In the main body of Oakwood Valley itself, we have a good loop that goes up the fire road from Tennessee Valley Road, and then loops back via a single track trail that may get cut off in the current plan. I disagree with the logic for cutting off that single track as it adds variety and good dog training elements to the loop. The majority of people I meet on this trail are more than happy to share it with dogs. Where is the science that says otherwise? There has been no negative impact from dogs on this trail in the past. The biggest problem with dogs here is with the owners bagging the poop, but not picking it up. I for one, am one of the neighbors who does pick it up, and other people's as well.

Corr. ID: 4382

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209547

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs should be mostly restricted to the fire roads and trails, and should not roam the chaparral at will and unleashed. There are dangers to them in the brush, and the wild animals should be free from predation by pets. Oakwood Valley Trail has delighted me weekly for years with deer, coyotes, bobcats, raccoons, rabbits, skunks, snakes and all manner of birds. My dogs are not allowed to pursue any of them. The proposal to close the "trail" side of Oakwood Valley Trail will dramatically degrade the experience; and, the suggestion of a double fence seems to be harassment of wildlife by interdicting free passage to drinking water.

Concern ID:

29235

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Fencing - Commenters oppose the preferred alternative including the fenced ROLA because it would diminish the natural environment and impede the movement of wildlife; the fenced ROLA will also cut off wildlife access to the creek. The preferred alternative would also impact more vegetation when compared to alternative D.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2118

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193389

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Continuous fencing on Oakwood Valley trail will significantly diminish enjoyment of the natural environment for all users including non-dog accompanied humans and horse back riders using this trail. Huge negative aesthetic impact.

Corr. ID: 2801

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201098

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a Marin City homeowner who lives just one block from the Pacheco fire road that connects to the Alta Trail and the GGNRA. I oppose the draft plan submitted by the Park Service that will change dog access to

this trail and the the Oakwood Valley/Tennessee Valley areas. I have two border collies that I take up on Alta Trail nearly every day, under my strict voice control. In my experience, the dog owners and walkers who use the trail are very responsible and respectful of both the environment and the wildlife in this habitat. The erosion on Alta Trail is not due to dogs, or any animals for that matter, but hard rains combined with vehicular and bike traffic . The draft map makes a hodgepodge of local trails- Oakwood Valley is off leash and fenced, while Alta is not. This makes no sense at all. I believe that Alta Trail should remain off leash as it stands now on existing maps. Furthermore, the Park Service is incorrectly marking the stretch of trail from the Donahue parking lot to the GGNRA border as federal property. This is private property with a county and NPS easement- NPS will not be able to enforce any dog code on this stretch, and the draft maps should be corrected accordingly to show the proper boundaries. The proposed fence along Oakwood Valley will limit access of native wildlife to their main water source- the creek that runs the length of the valley (and trail). The EFFECTS OF PROPOSED FENCING WILL BE FAR MORE DAMAGING TO WILDFIRE THAN DOG USE. I cannot believe that this made it into a draft proposal that should have contained an EIA that looked at this potential impact, as well as the parallel impacts of mountain bikers and hikers on this same area.

To restate, I am opposed to the NPS draft plan, and would like dog access to remain unchanged from the current conditions.

Corr. ID: 4096 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208435 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fencing and double gates seem a disruption to the rough natural beauty, the sense of open wilderness, and rhythm of the place. Any fence that allows the bobcat, coyote, and deer to pass uninhibited will not stop a dog. We dog-handlers are quite aware of where the trail is and can keep our dogs on the trail. If a dog goes off-trail, I can assure you it doesn't go anywhere but on paths established already by the animals who live there because the blackberry bushes, poison oak, and other bushes form a thick undergrowth. I am also concerned about even constructing the fencing. The building process would destroy current habitat for small critters (birds, chipmunks, mice, rats, snakes, slugs).

Concern ID:

29236

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The preferred alternative would cause parking and safety to be an issue at this site.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3912 **Organization:** Alto Bowl Horseowners Association

Comment ID: 205590 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The proposed Oakwood Valley ROLA has several practical deficiencies beyond denying access to other users. These problems include: a very narrow confined space with no options for dogs and handlers to move about the ROLA with adequate separation from others; a lack of spaciousness and sightlines that will obscure illegal or inappropriate activities; a lengthy fenced area that is a major barrier to passage of native animals across meadows; lack of safe parking on Tennessee Valley Road for the numbers of dog walkers likely to be attracted to the site; and excessive implementation, maintenance and enforcement costs. We understand that the ROLA proposed under alternative "C" for Oakwood Valley was a result of Negotiated Rulemaking Committee discussions; we believe that the unintended consequences of placing a ROLA at this location were not fully considered.

Corr. ID: 3959 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206059 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly object to the proposed establishment of a ROLA

in Oakwood Valley for several reasons. First, its construction and use will destroy the existing habitat. Second, it will increase the number of cars in an area where there is inadequate parking, which will cause further destruction as car owners will undoubtedly create their own parking spaces. Third, it is my experience, as a runner and dog walker in both Oakwood and Tennessee Valleys for the past 26 years, that an increasing number of dog owners do not obey the rules, and I would discourage an increase in the number of dogs and dog owners in the area for this reason. Mill Valley already has an excellent dog park near the Middle School. It is a large space with water access. Rather than create another dog park, I suggest we encourage use of this park, and protect the precious habitat of Oakwood Valley.

OV1300 - Oakwood Valley: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29237

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters support Alternative A at Oakwood Valley because there is no justification for the changes proposed, it is a prime recreational area used by park visitors, and because of the off-leash areas it provides to dog walkers and/or because few non-dog walking people use the area

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 476 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181777 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The places that are available offer wonderful opportunities for personal health and wellbeing for both dog owners and non-dog owners.

I urge you to not change the rules and regulations in Marin County and keep the access as outlined in Alternative A (the current situation) in this area.

Corr. ID: 1573 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190785 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The dog use on Alta and Oakwood Valley is the PRIME recreational use of these trails, no question about it - 75% of persons using it have dogs (off leash mostly, not including commercial walkers). Despite all of my time spent off trail (in Mission Blue habitat) only once have I ever encountered a dog that shouldn't have been there. 99.99999% stick to the trail/road.

On the basis of my experience (I am a wildlife ecologist, by profession) it appears to me that the decision to change the current dog policy on Oakwood Valley and Alta Ave trails/fire roads is based on abstractions and no real data. It is a recreational area and people recreate on those trails walking with their dogs (off leash) - my survey 75% (not including commercial walkers) of users. There is also plenty of wildlife.

I do not support allowing dogs (on leash) between Oakwood Valley pond and Alta. This would be consistent policy for use of Alta and Oakwood Valley. Therefore, Alternative A

Corr. ID: 2116 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193382 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I walk my dogs on Oakwood Trail daily. Most of the people on this trail have dogs and most unleashed. There are very few no leash trails, pls do not take this away from all of us responsible dog owners. Dogs need off leash exercise and so do their owners!

Corr. ID: 2119 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193393 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Oakwood Valley loop needs to remain the way it is - free for dogs to run off-leash. Very few non-dog people use it.

Concern ID: 29238
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative D; it would have the least impact of all alternatives on vegetation.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4315 **Organization:** State of California Department of Fish and Game
Comment ID: 209388 **Organization Type:** State Government
Representative Quote: Oakwood Valley

The NPS Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) differs from the Environmentally Preferable Alternative in the designation of a regulated off-leash area (ROLA) on the Oakwood Valley Fire Road. Under Alternative D, dogs would be required to be leashed. As stated in the draft EIS, the adoption of Alternative C at this site is likely to result in minor adverse impacts to vegetation. DFG recommends that Alternative D be selected as the adopted alternative as it, by requiring dogs to be leashed on the fire road, would largely avoid impacts to vegetation which may result from trampling, digging, and waste.

Concern ID: 29239
CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA - Commenters desire more off-leash dog walking areas at Oakwood Valley.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2239 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200878 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: This is to request that you please consider expanding the areas in the proposed plan where dogs are allowed off leash under voice control. In particular Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley and Cronkite Beach.

Concern ID: 29240
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative B because of the absence of the fenced ROLA at Oakwood Valley which would not create adverse impacts to wildlife.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates
Comment ID: 209118 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: OAKWOOD VALLEY FIRE ROAD AND TRAIL. Alternative B would be better for wildlife than Alternative C because of the absence of fencing proposed along both sides of Oakwood Valley Trail. A fence would prevent wildlife from crossing from one side of the trail to the other side thereby providing a barrier to the movement of wildlife. Especially for small areas of habitat, such as the Oakwood Valley area, it is important that wildlife have access to as large an area as possible and no area should be precluded from use by fencing. Dogs should be on leash along the Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail.

Concern ID: 30642
CONCERN STATEMENT: On-Leash - Commenters desire more on-leash dog walking areas at Oakwood Valley.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4005 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 206273 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I support the proposal for on-leash access on these fire roads, and the 2 trails that provide access to them:
 The fire roads:
 Coastal Trail from Muir Beach to Coastal Fire Road to Coyote Ridge Trail (a fire road) to Miwok Trail (a fire road);
 Miwok Trail from Highway 1 to Coyote Ridge Trail;
 Miwok Trail from Tennessee Valley Road to Coyote Ridge Trail;

Marin Drive from Tam Valley to the Miwok Trail;
County View Road from Tam Valley to the Miwok Trail;
Tennessee Valley Road (or the adjacent Rhubarb Trail (Marin County trail)) to
Oakwood Valley Fire Road;
Oakwood Valley Fire Road from Tennessee Valley Road to Alta Trail (a fire road);
Alta Trail from Donahue Avenue in Marin City to Rodeo Valley Trail;
Pacheco Fire Road from Marin City to Alta Trail;
Orchard Fire Road from Marin City to Alta Trail;
Rodeo Avenue from Highway 101 to Alta Trail.

OV1400 - Oakwood Valley: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29241

CONCERN STATEMENT: NPS should allow dogs on Alta Trail to connect with the Oakwood Valley Fire Road, there is a preference for dog walking loops rather than short out and back trails.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1308 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195046 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I also noticed that in some of the alternatives, you allow no dogs on the link to Alta trail portion where dogs are allowed. Please dont do this - it is great to able to be take a nice loop hike, and when you eliminate linkages between dog allowed areas, it takes a lot of fun out of it.

Corr. ID: 3934 **Organization:** 3rd Supervisorial District of the County of Marin

Comment ID: 205852 **Organization Type:** County Government

Representative Quote: We would request that the Oakwood Valley Fire Road and the Oakwood Valley Trail be a continuous loop with 'dogs on leash' at a minimum (off leash would be preferable) and that the connector to the Alta Trail and up to Donahue be designated as 'dog-friendly', as well. It would be preferable to leave this trail available for dogs along its entirety, creating a loop that can be accessed from several different points (Tennessee Valley Rd, Donahue St. and the Orchard Fire Rd). Please note that there is the appearance of an equity issue here, as the trail is primarily accessed at the top of Donahue in Marin City. This is a community with some of the highest rates of heart disease, diabetes and childhood obesity in Marin. Having this loop accessible to all ages in this community, and especially children, is seen as a critical component to creating a healthy community.

Concern ID: 29242

CONCERN STATEMENT: Fencing - Commenters suggest removing the fenced ROLA at Oakwood Valley (or allowing it to open while on horseback) because it precludes use of the trail by other users such as cyclists and horseback riders and because there was no consensus regarding its inclusion as part of the dog plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3912 **Organization:** Alto Bowl Horseowners Association

Comment ID: 205588 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The NPS preferred alternative "C" for Oakwood Valley is of particular concern to the ABHA. It proposes the conversion of the Oakwood Valley Fire Road to a fenced and gated Regulated Off Leash Area (ROLA) of very narrow configuration. This would essentially eliminate use of the fireroad by bicycles and horses, such use being currently permitted. The Oakwood Valley Trail on the west side of Oakwood Valley is presently designated hiker-only, so under alternative "C" equestrian access to the pond at the upper end of the valley would be eliminated. While this dead-end trail might seem insignificant on its own, it represents a popular destination for horseback rides from Horse Hill via the Mill Valley Multiple Use Path and Tennessee Valley Trail through Tam Junction. Any

dog management plan that reduces or eliminates trail access for other users is not acceptable.

Corr. ID: 3934 **Organization:** 3rd Supervisorial District of the County of Marin

Comment ID: 205851 **Organization Type:** County Government

Representative Quote: Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Oakwood Valley Trail to Alta Trail: The most striking concern here is the gated and fenced dog run concept. We have heard anecdotally from several members of the "Dog Tech" subcommittee (Roger Roberts, Capt. Cindy Machado, Jane Woodman and Sonya Hanson, among others) that there was in fact not consensus regarding this - and the 'assent' that was heard at the meeting was meant to be ironic. The gated and fenced idea seems to run contrary to the hoped for experience that being out in nature would provide.

Corr. ID: 4377 **Organization:** Marin Horse Council

Comment ID: 209167 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The ROLA proposed for the Oakwood Valley Fire Road will be fenced along the sides, as well as gated at both ends. As equestrians, we would like to see the type of gate that could be opened from horseback. It has been noted that, aesthetically, a fence along both sides of the fire road will detract from the "wilderness" feeling of the trail. The fence would also block wildlife from crossing the trail. That said, alternative C remains most favorable. As for the single-track trail (across the creek and roughly parallel to the fire road), it would be desirable to see the trail improved so that it could be enjoyed by both hikers and equestrians.

Corr. ID: 4685 **Organization:** Marin Conservation League

Comment ID: 209983 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The ROLA proposed for the Oakwood Valley Fire Road will be fenced along the sides, as well as gated at both ends. Hikers will share the fire road with off-leash dogs. We have several concerns about this proposal. First, it is not clear where the fencing would be located ' adjacent to the fire road or at some distance? In either case, if fencing is effective to contain dogs it will also interfere with free passage of wildlife across the valley. Second, it is not clear how the proposed ROLA will affect other users ' hikers, equestrians, and bikers. Oakwood Valley Fire Road is currently used by all three, and the almost parallel Trail is used by hikers and dog walkers only. It is closed to bikes and not usable by equestrians because of a narrow and unsafe bridge and steps at one end. If the proposed ROLA on Oakwood Valley Fire Road is closed to horses, equestrians will lose access to Oakwood Valley. While this road is not heavily used by horses, it is used by riders from Horse Hill. Also, if the ROLA is closed to bikes, this would force mountain bikers onto Oakwood Trail, making that trail unsafe for hikers. Resolution of these potential problems will require more study.

Corr. ID: 4687 **Organization:** County of Marin Dept. of Parks and Open Space

Comment ID: 227455 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: There is much confusion about what the public supports in Oakwood Valley, especially in regard to the ROLA area, i.e., the enclosure. The county urges reexamination of this alternative and the concept of this enclosed area. We urge that some off leash trail use be allowed to continue in the area.

Concern ID: 29243

CONCERN STATEMENT: Professional dog walkers should be required to have dogs on leash at all times, or otherwise be banned.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4119 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 208520 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to see ALL "professional" dog walkers with more than three (3) dogs per person be REQUIRED to have the dogs ON LEASH AT ALL TIMES when using the Alta Trail, Oakwood Valley Trail, connected fire roads, etc in this area; or BANNED COMPLETELY!

Concern ID: 29244

CONCERN STATEMENT:

ROLA - Commenters suggest adding more off-leash areas to Oakwood Valley including Oakwood Valley Fire Road and the Oakwood Valley Trail/Alta Fire Road loop. In addition the park should consider electronic leash as an alternative to physical leashes.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2142

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200572

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep the Oakwood Valley F.R. and Oakwood Valley Trail/Alta Fire Road/loop open to dog walking - off-leash. But use a plan similar to the East Bay Parks which allows dogs off-leash under voice control. Also, consider electronic leashes as an alternative to physical leashes. E-leashes are an excellent control and help train dogs to behave properly off-leash. We have such limited access to off-leash areas in Southern Marin, don't take more away. Please consider adding more off-leash areas, where appropriate.

PN4000 - Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority

Concern ID: 29696

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The enabling legislation for the GGNRA mandates that the park is for urban recreation. It is not in an isolated place, but in the middle of a large urban center, and must meet the recreational needs of Bay Area residents and visitors.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 324

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181086

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Although dogs are not allowed off-leash in most national parks, I feel that the GGNRA is unusual in that it is within a large metropolitan area and so its use should be balanced to accommodate the needs of local residents and visitors. It will never be a real wilderness area on the scale of other national parks.

Corr. ID: 578

Organization: San Francisco Professional Dog Walkers Association

Comment ID: 182095

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Preferred Alternative severely restricts recreational access for people with dogs, a fundamental violation of the reason the GGNRA was created. In the legislation that created it, the reason for the creation of the GGNRA is listed as "the maintenance of needed recreational open space." Off-leash dog walking is among the recreational activities listed as traditionally occurring in the land that was to become the GGNRA. There is no off-leash access in San Mateo County in the Preferred Alternative and that must be changed

Corr. ID: 617

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181199

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding the proposed dog rules, please keep in mind that the GGNRA serves an urban area populated by people and dogs, both of whom like to access the beaches and parks. The GGNRA is different than other national parks in this way. Please do not impose undue limits on dogs and their people.

Corr. ID: 2208

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200722

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA has for decades provided open space for all to enjoy.

And the "all" includes dogs because they are a part of families.

The small percentage of open space that allows dogs should be left unchanged because it provides for those of us who may not be able to otherwise use the area.

Corr. ID: 2880

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202900

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am concerned for many reasons, some of - Given our urban setting, the advantages in the Management Plan simply do not outweigh the constraints; it is not an appropriate plan to apply in an urban setting. While I agree with the basis of preservation outlined in the EIS, I feel that the plan is not balanced in a practical way with our urban environment.

Corr. ID: 4026

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207088

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In stating that additional ROLAs (Regulated Off-Leash Areas) will not be considered", the GGNRA violates the court ordered procedures in US v. Barton. The GGNRA again seeks to ban historical recreational uses without public input. "Regulated Off-Leash Areas" should be considered like any other recreational pursuit, and decisions based on the merits of a given area based upon objective criteria - including historical uses.

Concern ID:

29697

CONCERN STATEMENT:

GGNRA is not consistent with the mission and legislation of the Park Service. Allowing off-leash dogs within NPS land is contrary to NPS policy and regulations. The DEIS should be corrected to adhere to these regulations.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 626

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181302

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The National Parks are "Parks for All Forever," and allowing a use that significantly degrades the landscapes, prevents use by a majority of visitors, and causes irreparable harm to the flora and fauna is inconsistent with this vision and should not be allowed.

Corr. ID: 2188

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200582

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs are antithetical to preservation of natural and cultural resources which is the National Park's stated mission. So this plan is a failure to fulfill that mission in any meaningful way. No dogs should be allowed on national park lands except picnic areas and paved roads. To allow otherwise undermines the federal regulations on these lands and other national park lands.

Corr. ID: 2565

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195645

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Allowing unleashed dogs within the park runs contrary to the parks mission and is inconsistent with the notion of making the park a place for wildlife. And it is not just about wildlife: Unleashed dogs are also sometimes a threat to people and other dogs, and they interfere with many visitors' enjoyment of the shoreline.

Concern ID:

29698

CONCERN STATEMENT:

If this plan is approved, the GGNRA it would no longer be meeting the recreational mandate it was created under. The enabling legislation included dog walking as a recreational activity, and thus the Park Service does not have the authority to remove this activity. Some commenters felt the City of San Francisco should take back the land originally deeded to GGNRA if the changes in the EIS are undertaken.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 505

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181896 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to vehemently oppose any of the proposed restrictions to off-leash dog walking areas in the GGNRA. I have read a good portion of the DEIS and feel it is an anti-dog manifesto disguised as an environmental issue. This is a National RECREATION Area, not a National Park. Specifically Fort Funston and Crissy Field are not pristine natural areas... heck, they're former sites of military encampments in a densely populated city environment. The current dog walking area was promised to us in the 1979 Pet Policy when the park was transferred from the City to the the GGNRA, and there is no legitimate reason to renege on this agreement

Corr. ID: 613 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181195 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA is an urban park, where off-leash dog walking by responsible pet owners has always been allowed. To change a long-established past practice is unfair.

If the GGNRA cannot abide by the terms under which San Francisco ceded its lands, then the GGNRA should turn the lands back over to San Francisco.

I strongly object to your new dog management plan.

Corr. ID: 1497 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191341 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Judge made his decision on the basic language of the formation of the GGNRA by Rep. Burton and signed by President Carter that the encompassing area be left as is for perpetuity. And thus we have what is commonly known as the Grandfather Clause, and specifically interpreted that dog walkers would enjoy the privileges they historically had. It would logically follow that any and all further acquisitions to be included in the GGNRA would also meet that mandate. This is addressed in this report that any new areas would fall under the national park service 36 code. This certainly violates the basic language and more specifically the spirit and intent of the law that formed the GGNRA

Corr. ID: 4010 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206738 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There has long been dog owner recreation on the lands comprising the GGNRA. These lands were transferred to the NPS with the understanding that this historical use would continue. Moreover, Congress clearly intended that the GGNRA serve a "parks to the people" function. The DEIS proposed alternative is inconsistent both with historical use and with Congressional intent.

Corr. ID: 4010 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206736 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It appears that the NPS has changed Congressional intent, and I do not see any rationale or legal foundation for doing so in the discussion of the enabling legislation (DEIS page 36). I request that the NPS provide a rationale for this change.

The DEIS preferred alternative may be consistent with the NPS' modification of Congressional intent, but it is not consistent with the enabling legislation.

Concern ID:
CONCERN
STATEMENT:

29699
Commenters questioned the NPS authority to dictate use on the lower portion of Alta Trail on the Donahue as on-leash dog walking, as this area was an NPS easement, but not within GGNRA boundaries.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4312 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209369 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Using the excuse that this is endangered blue butterfly habitat to impose a leash requirement is a red herring. The dogs do not trample the lupine (blue butterfly food source) growing in the area, and the humans generally stay on the road, where the lupine does not grow. You have also included the lower part of Alta Avenue (starting at the Donahue cul-de-sac) as a leash required zone, which surprises me since this stretch, although having an NPS easement, is not even within the Park boundaries. I would not think you would legally have the authority to impose a Dog Management Plan on this portion of Alta Avenue, which lies outside the park

PN7000 - Purpose and Need: Adequacy of EIS Purpose and Need

Concern ID: 29700

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters questioned the need for this project to occur given the reasons provided for action, and the current situation. They noted that many of the justifications given for the new restrictions were not based in data or other means, and therefore were not adequately proven, and were against other policies in the park. The need for the project should be more clearly defined.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 127 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182221 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: "The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires an environmental impact statement (EIS) to briefly provide a statement of purpose and need for the action the agency is proposing."

Stated purpose for taking action, and why the proposals do nothing to address these "needs".

? Preserve and protect natural and cultural resources and natural processes

In all of the documents listed on this site, I couldn't find any scientific studies or facts stating definitively that dogs negatively impact the natural and cultural resources more than humans alone. As coyotes (wild dogs) are native to much of areas of concerns, dogs are simply an extension of nature.

? Provide a variety of visitor experiences

99% of the areas of concern are free of dogs under the current rules and regulations. If variety of visitor experiences are a priority, dogs should be allowed in a greater percentage of the available land.

? Improve visitor and employee safety

I did not see any documentation regarding decrease in visitor and employee safety due to off-leash dogs. In my opinion, an off-leash dog is much safer than an on-leash dog as the majority of dogs will attempt "flight" before "fight". However, on a leash the ability to flee is removed, and only the fight remains. In the absence of clear evidence that displacing off-leash areas with on-leash improves safety, how can this blanket statement regarding improved safety be considered?

? Reduce user conflicts

The documents cite confusing rules and regulations regarding off-leash and on-

leash and resultant user conflicts. I have reviewed proposals B-E and find them as equally confusing and convoluted as the status quo (proposal A) if not more so. There is no chance yet another confusing set of changes on top of the current rules will improve comprehension of the policies and thus reduce user conflicts.

? Maintain park resources and values for future generations

The use of the term "maintain" here is out of place as only proposal A (status quo) maintains the current rules and values. As for resources, that was addressed in the first bullet.

Corr. ID: 464

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181747

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If it's for employee safety, then how many employees have been injured? If it's for environmental reasons, then explain how dogs are the culprit, but surfers, tour buses full of tourists, horse riders, bikers and hikers aren't. If it's to reduce conflicts, then how many and how severe have those conflicts been? (I've been taking my dog to all of these places for a greater part of the last ten years and have rarely, if ever seen any major conflict.)

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192042

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS in the Need for Action also fails to characterize accurately the urgency for action in the following sentence. The DEIS should be revised to delete this sentence. "The conflicts will likely escalate if not addressed in a comprehensive plan/EIS."

- Statistics provided in table 9 on dog management issues reflect a significant decline in all forms of incident from 2007 to 2008. During that period, the number of all incidents declined by 42%. The most serious categories of incidents declined by 61% while leash law violations declined by 39%, suggesting that dog bites/attacks and disturbance of wildlife showed a declining trend.

Corr. ID: 1905

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200479

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With regard to the EIS itself, the P&N, or specifically the Need Statement, is incomplete and does not include the detail and clarity that NEPA requires. Stating that there "could be" a problem and then describing an element of what may be the problem is all too theoretical. Other than a conceptually 'good idea', as defined by a likely non-dog owner at some point in time, there is no real Need that is clearly defined. The Purpose however states that a clear, enforceable policy is needed. Well that makes sense. I don't disagree that in fact there 'could be' a problem in the future and we should, as with many issues related to the environment, do everything we can to be good stewards. But it is just lazy to state that the appropriate 'clear, enforceable policy' is just to overly restrict use of these parks. The fact is that the EIS did not look at a reasonable range of alternatives. There is not enough consideration of limited restrictions or, perhaps better, new opportunities, trails, resources for the dogs and owners. There is not consideration of maintaining the GGNRA as they are today, perhaps some minor fixes on specific parks based on local problems, BUT with better enforcement of current laws. Enforcement is largely limited (and would be still if any of the action alternatives were chosen) because there are very limited Park rangers and enforcement officers. This is a problem, I agree. The cost of this EIS could have been better put to the hiring or better pay for Park rangers. Ultimately, if enforcement officers are included in the plan, add those to a new alternative looking at fewer restrictions allowing dog owners to use these resources in a positive way.

Corr. ID: 4451 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208398 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The Need for Action, however, is never scientifically or properly established. The DEIS makes many assumptions about the negative effects of dogs on the parks in determining its need for action, yet almost never backs up these assumptions with site-specific proof.

PN8000 - Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action

Concern ID: 29701
CONCERN STATEMENT: The validations provided for the proposed EIS are not based in fact, and thus cannot be used to show the need for the proposed actions. These objectives do not align with the recreational mandate included in the enabling legislation of the park. The DEIS does not meet the objectives for visitor experience. An objective to provide sufficient off-leash dog walking areas should be added.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 85 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181884 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The objectives listed in the executive summary all relate to controlling, reducing and restricting dog access. Given the park's charter to provide 'public use and enjoyment' and 'needed recreation open space' an important objective should be to preserve sufficient space for off-leash dog access.
Corr. ID: 600 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 182162 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Currently, there exist no reasons (pertaining to safety, ecology, or otherwise) which should merit revision to the long standing policies concerning dogs, leashes, their owners, and the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area.
Corr. ID: 1850 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192043 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: With no information on the actual number of dogs, visitors, activities and source of visitors, the DEIS has no foundation for designing an appropriate Plan. (It is ironic that as part of the Compliance Management Plan the DEIS foresees counting the number of dogs at each site.)The DEIS thus fails to meet the above Objective on Visitor Experience and Safety. The DEIS should be revised to address the following concerns regarding lack of information on visitation as support for DEIS.

PO2010 - Park Operations: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 29489
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters expressed a lack of park ranger enforcement under current conditions. Many said the presence of park officials was sparse in all areas of the park, and ticketing educating the public on regulations was uncommon, leading to more non-compliance by dog owners.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2307 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200624 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I've never seen a ranger, or any other authority figure, call these scofflaws to task. As long as there is little or no enforcement, they will continue to impudently flaunt the rules.
Corr. ID: 2727 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195583 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I live on Ocean Beach and visit the beach on a daily basis.

I am not a dog owner, but I genuinely love and respect all animals. The issue involves, of course, the owner and not the owned.

Right now the vast majority of dogs run free on all sections of the beach. Dogs are not under control by their owners either by voice or leash. I've seen the signs posted to protect endangered species of birds on the beach, and the big metal bird, but these prohibitions are ignored by most owners. Further, I have never seen any attempt by a GGNRA officer to enforce the existing codes. Indeed, how can anyone stop a running dog not on a leash from violating the protected space in season? Or attacking another animal? Or worse, attacking children and others who want to enjoy the beach?

Corr. ID: 3937

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205881

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: However, I see little reference to enforcement in the DDMP. While education is preferable to enforcement, that is only true if education results in compliance. My own efforts to inform visitors to the SPWPA that their dogs are supposed to be on leash has not always resulted in compliance.

The education and enforcement efforts will require considerable manpower. For example, at the SPWPA, personnel will need to be regularly present on weekends during the Snowy Plover season to, at first, inform dog owners that dogs are prohibited, and thereafter cite dog owners who do not comply with the prohibition. In my many visits to the SPWPA, I have never seen any NPS personnel, or volunteers who are authorized to engage in outreach to dog owners

Corr. ID: 4108

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208482

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2) It does not address the GGNRA's failure to enforce existing dog rules. There are no off-leash trails in these lands in Pacifica, but there are some who choose to ignore this. They are a minority of the dog hikers to be sure, but I do see them from time to time. And why is this? I can give a least 2 reasons. First, there are no legal alternatives for off-leash dog walking in Pacifica. None. The closest place is Fort Funston. Second, there is almost zero chance that they will be caught by a ranger. In my 6 years of dog hiking I have seen a ranger on only 3 occasions.

Corr. ID: 4181

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208765

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The existing laws and regulations need to be regularly enforced and then the resulting environment studied prior to determining the goals and scope of the dog management plan. I visit the GGNRA parks nearly 3-4 times a week and never see rangers providing education to the public about current park rules and regulations (providing this education is required in the document that gives the land to the GGNRA), enforcing dangerous dog laws, voice control or poop pickup. We have these rules for a reason and those of us that have well behaving off leash dogs should not be punished for the failings of a few. Why has the GGNRA neglected to supervise these parklands and then assume to be able to write a report that creates more restrictions and require more enforcement without doing any studies to try and understand the community that uses the facility and cares for it?

Corr. ID: 4214

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208877

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Yesterday I went to the beach and saw one shorebird left. The beach was nearly empty of people, too. A man with a dog threw the ball almost directly at the bird, flushing it. When I suggested that he had the rest of the beach to throw the ball; it didn't have to be at the one remaining shorebird, his response was

two-fold. The bird wasn't a plover, and his dog is allowed to be off-leash now.

There were Park Service patrolling but they can't be everywhere and they're very visible. It's too easy to carry a leash and put it on the dog when you see them coming, and watch your dog chase birds the rest of the time.

That incident yesterday wasn't about the dog getting exercise. The dog had the whole beach. It was about the owner wanting complete personal freedom no matter what the consequences to others.

Concern ID:

29490

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Relations with rangers have not been positive for many visitors to the park, and have created doubts for some park users about the effectiveness and responsiveness of rangers at GGNRA. The use of horses for park rangers at Crissy Field also is an unnecessary risk.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4248

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209213

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the proposed GGNRA "Dog Management" plan and hope you will do what you can to stop it. The plan is extreme. I hope you can help stop this proposed plan. It infringes and picks away and the lifestyle we enjoy as San Franciscans. I witnessed today a National Park Police Officer scare off families enjoying themselves in the Great Meadow of Fort Mason, in the shadow of Phillip Burton. They were playing with their dogs and enjoying the Memorial Day holiday. When the National Park patrol car came into site the entire park emptied. Families with children ran the other direction with their dogs. The Great Meadow was left empty. This is not the kind of place that I want San Francisco and California to be. Please oppose the GGNRA "Dog Management" plan.

Corr. ID: 4270

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209094

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing as I am very concerned about a GGNRA (or Nat'l Park) park ranger patrol using horses at the Crissy Field beach area. This area has allowable off-leash dog use and the practice of patrol on horseback seems like an unnecessarily risky practice with potential for injury to dogs and/or their owners.

Many dogs (especially "city dogs") have not seen a horse before. Seeing a very large, unfamiliar animal in their midst is bound to create some interest or alarm, may cause the dog to run over to the horse to see it better and may include warning barking. Park rangers have warned dog owners whose dogs start approaching to keep dogs away to avoid getting kicked. In one incidence, a friend's dog was PEPPER-SPRAYED by a park ranger because the dog was approaching and barking. The ranger did not wait for the owner to come over and get the dog. I know this dog (a sweet, mellow Lab) he is not aggressive in the least he was just alarmed. The owner subsequently got the pepper spray on herself as well as her two young children (in trying to clean off the dog at home). Completely inappropriate response by the park ranger.

Because of this, I am very alarmed when I see a mounted park ranger at the beach. I go to the beach about 5 times a week. I always grab my dog until the horse passes by to avoid anything happening to him. However, I can't always see the horse approach so sometimes the horse is close by the time I see him. My dog is a well-behaved, non-aggressive dog (a Lab) and also not familiar with horses.

Concern ID:

29491

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Signs and fences that indicate areas where dogs are not allowed have fallen into disrepair or are not present, making it difficult for park visitors to know when they have entered into sensitive or restricted areas. In addition, clear signage between city and park boundaries is not present or clear. These both increase non-compliance issues.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4047

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207338

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Fort Funston, you'll sometimes see people and/or dogs exploring beyond fences and beyond the areas once delineated by now-broken or missing fences.

The consensus among dog people at Fort Funston is that they'd be happy to respect any and all currently off-limits areas, whether they are for safety or for the restoration of native habitat. But the consensus also says that it's unclear where you are currently prohibited to walk at Fort Funston. With a few fence repairs and well-placed signs, the GGNRA could clarify which areas are currently off-limits. Dog people at Fort Funston agree: this would virtually eliminate the encroachment of dogs and dog walkers on these areas.

Corr. ID: 4420

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207299

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: GGNRA-controlled conditions on the ground influence compliance with regulations. I visited Fort Funston May 14, 2011. There has been no apparent maintenance there for the last ten years: Fences are down or covered by sand; cables are missing; signs are missing, out-of-date, or illegible from weathering, etc. The breeding bank swallows are there, but the presence of the swallows is not indicated in any way; the bank swallow protection area shown on DEIS Maps 16 and 16A-E is not marked. A new visitor could easily be out of compliance and not know it, because GGNRA has not taken normal managerial actions.

GGNRA simply abdicates managerial responsibility when its only solution to perceived non-compliance is to further restrict recreational activity. GGNRA actually proposes to forbid itself to take any reasonable management action that would increase off leash area by even a small amount.

Corr. ID: 4533

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209687

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In the headlands above Rodeo Beach, the signs do not include any indication that dogs are permitted, although there is signage relating to bicycles and horses. As a result, conflict occurs, people may unwittingly violate the policies, and people who may not want to deal with dogs don't have any information as to where they may go without dealing with off leash dogs (such as the West Beach area of Crissy Field). With respect to education and enforcement, people (including those without dogs) often don't understand the impact they may have by not staying on trails or by entering protected areas of vegetation, but once they understand the consequences (both to the natural resources and to themselves if they could receive a fine), they often will change their behavior. The GGRNA should be doing things now to make the current status work and the Plan/DEIS should include action plans relating to improved signage, education and enforcement.

Corr. ID: 4533

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209686

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: For instance, at Crissy Field there are no signs in the eastern parking lot area or along the beach or promenade that indicate that dogs may be off leash under voice control or what specific areas are included in that

policy. Instead, the signs indicate that one must "obey all posted rules", but posted rules relating to dogs are few and far between and don't delineate where dog walking ' on or off leash ' may take place, other than prohibitions at the West Beach boundaries. Near the West Beach Wildlife Protection Area, one sign says that dogs must be on leash in the "Snowy Plover Protection Area", without specifying that there is currently a 45 day period of time when dogs are allowed off leash under voice control. (That sign also states that one "MUST...recreate on the wet sand away from the upper parts of the beach...", but my understanding is that was a suggestion that was made (by Crissy Field Dog Group), but it is not part of the regulations in effect.) Further, a sign along the bridge over the lagoon indicates that Crissy Field is a resting area for the protected Western Snowy Plover, without specifying that the West Beach is preserved for that purpose (the sign makes it sound as though the threatened birds are trying to rest everywhere in the Crissy area.)

Corr. ID: 4598

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210055

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Fort Funston, considerable areas have been replanted, and there the newly planted and developing areas are clearly indicated with environmental barriers. I find this very attractive, easy to see and respect. I applaud the work of those who have done this planting. As a concerned environmentalist of many years, I am delighted to see this work. It enhances the area and allows visitors to see sections of native planting take hold.

I might mention that at other areas of Fort Funston a number of years ago, fenced off areas (with dunes and ice-plant) were fairly clearly marked, but currently the fences and signs are in poor enough shape as to be quite unnoticeable. Removal of the ice-plant ground cover, which was put in by the Army prior to World War II has resulted in wind-blown sand drifts that are constantly shifting, covering trails and fencing. Newcomers to the area may be excused for not noticing which areas to keep out of. I consider these folks to be uneducated rather than irresponsible. Better fencing and signage indicating the current off-leash areas is clearly called for to maintain and protect the environment.

Corr. ID: 4688

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210088

Organization Type: State Government

Representative Quote: Clear Signage at Enforcement Transition Zones: There are a number of locations where there is a transition between GGNRA and City- managed lands. Without clear and prominent signage a person walking a dog may suddenly find they are no longer on City property but GGNRA land and in violation of the new regulations. An example of such a transition zone is at the south end of the berm (owned by the City of San Francisco but managed and used by Pacificans) which transitions seamlessly into GGNRA Mori Point land. Therefore we encourage GGNRA to clearly post these transition zones.

Corr. ID: 4705

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209743

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I walk my dog at Fort Funston and it could hardly be compared to other parks such as Yosemite. I have never seen a ranger patrolling the area. I only see maintenance workers clearing out the trashcans. The pathways have potholes and fences are falling down. The National Park Service has never tried to police the area. There is very little signage put out. Fewer residents use the park during the week. It is during the weekend that more people use the park when there could be more problems with dogs. Rangers should be present to cite any violations. I really get the feeling that with the National Deficit as it is, the leaders of the National Park Service would prefer to leave Fort Funston abandoned with very little use than to have it be a robust recreational area for the residents of San Francisco and San Mateo counties.

Concern ID: 29492

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Signage is currently good at the parks, but people still choose not to regard posted rules and regulations for dog walking. This results in impacts to other visitors, wildlife, and habitat due to non-compliant users. Regulations need to be enforced.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1500 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200069 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a multi-year resident of the great highway (I live in between Judah and Sloat), I can personally say that I witness dog owners walking their dogs off leash all the time during the snowy plover protection period. There is AMPLE education about this - signs posted everywhere - and yet dog owners continue to break the law.

Just this morning I witnessed two boxers off leash in front of moraga street, running up and down the beach chasing about 100 snowy plovers across the intertidal zone. The birds would land again, and the dogs would continue to chase.

A couple of weeks ago, I watched a lady's off leash dog chase a group of plovers into the sea; and a red-tailed hawk swooped down out of nowhere and attacked a plover, breaking its neck.

I hope that existing leash laws are more strongly enforced, that education around these leash laws is stronger, and that the ENTIRE OCEAN BEACH AREA from the cliff house to fort funston be made a leashed area.

Corr. ID: 2252 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201006 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2. The tolerance for non-compliance of off-leash activities is FAR too low. Every single time I go out in our parks, I see them overrun with off-leash dogs, running directly under signs that say dogs should be on-leash. In general, I think the signage is good. It's just that no one enforces it. When one person lets his dog off-leash, other people want to, also. It's a spiral. The plan should strive for 95% compliance. There should be friendly tickets, and perhaps even warnings, or people around to verbally re-enforce the signage.

Corr. ID: 2370 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201192 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There were clear signs right now in the various beaches that are being violated. I would like stricter measures to be taken to enforce the new regulations. I am all for certain areas for pet recreation. But please enforce the rules, appearing lax only makes things worse

Concern ID: 29493

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Many commenters expressed that their attempts to contact enforcement have not been successful, and that their own attempts to address non-compliance have often been met with hostility.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1476 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 199986 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We strongly support either on leash only or prohibited areas for dogs. Our experience has been that owners feel they have the right to run their animals off leash irrespective of existing law or ordinance. Off leash dogs threaten humans and other dogs and adversely affect wildlife and habitat.

Almost without exception they respond in an adversarial and occasionally combative manner when asked to leash their animal(s). Even in those areas where

signage of the on leash rule is clearly posted, non compliance is the rule rather than the exception. We would support an aggressive ticketing policy.

Corr. ID: 2179 **Organization:** Equestrian

Comment ID: 200635 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My efforts in the way of phone calls to the rangers and letters to the GGNRA to do something about the growing off leash dog situation never seems to make a difference as enforcement stays minimal, phone calls to rangers ignored, and people and animals are still getting hurt.

I often feel a tragedy will have to occur before this problem gets resolved and the simple solution to keep dogs on leash finally gets implemented.

Concern ID:

29518

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Visitor experiences with the rangers in the park have been safe and positive.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4080

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207799 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Our considerable experiences at Ocean Beach have proven contrary to the DEIS and that the current situation is safe for all (humans, dogs, snowy plovers, etc.) and that the recreational areas provide an invaluable resource for us and our lifestyle. During all of our time visiting Ocean Beach these past couple of years, we have only had safe and positive experiences with park rangers, most of whom engage us in small talk about our dogs, whether on or off leash. Our dogs pose no danger to the wildlife or public, in fact most day's people and children want to pet or play with our dogs. And with our frequent visits to the beach, our dogs have learned "no birds" means no disturbing the wildlife.

Concern ID:

31544

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The park service replacement of signage (from maps to signs that said no dogs) is indicative the current issues with NPS management and enforcement. Such measures increased public distrust of park service management, and noncompliance with leash restrictions.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4697

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227450 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Certain areas of Ocean Beach had been designated as off leash areas, and other portions designated as on leash where the Park Service had identified a need to avoid the possibility of interaction with Snowy Plovers. There were clear signs at the beach with maps showing exactly where the off leash and on leash areas began and ended. By and large the public obeyed the restrictions. One could watch beach walkers routinely running and playing freely with their dogs off leash while carrying leashes and then stopping to clip on the leashes when getting into the restricted Snowy Plover area.

However, that cooperative compliance ended when the Park Service tore out those clear signs with the maps and replaced them with signs that instructed that dogs must be on leash at all times. As a result we had a situation where the public distrusted and ignored the signs completely and there is no information regarding the special area. I saw off leash dogs in the area where previously they would be leashed due to the identified special protection need. Hence, by adopting a nominal universal policy that is unenforceable and unpopular

the Park Service actually had the opposite effect ' increasing the likelihood of off leash dogs in the identified natural resource risk area. If the Park Service cannot possibly achieve enforcement of an overall ban, it should not attempt a partial enforcement that will merely cause migration of park users from areas previously identified as appropriate due to their lower protection need into other areas that have a higher protection need.

PO4000 - Park Operations: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Concern ID: 29494

CONCERN Commenters stated that the proposed rule would cause people to walk dogs off leash illegally, and **STATEMENT:**questioned how enforcement would be possible if current rules could not even be enforced. The new rules must be adequately enforced, but would be very difficult to enforce. Additional staff would be necessary to enforce rules and ticket offenders.

Representative **Corr. ID:** 239

Organization: *Not Specified*

Quote(s):

Comment ID: 180789

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If there is no avenue for walkers to be responsible and legally walk dogs off leash, that increases the likelihood of dog walkers using GGNRA areas illegally. Walkers who violate on-leash regulations are also more likely to ignore common courtesy guidelines such as cleaning up after their dogs and keeping dogs under voice control.

Corr. ID: 658

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181515

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If GGNRA is going to have dog policies, they must be enforced, which will require adequate staff and a willingness to levy fines, high enough to get the owners' attention.

Corr. ID: 3700

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202222

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is imperative, whatever agreed policy is implemented, that leash and voice control requirements be strictly enforced in all areas at all times. We have already seen that lack of enforcement under the existing rules has led to erosion of the rules such that many areas have become de facto off-leash areas. This cannot continue if the NPS is to ensure the safety of all visitors and protection of natural resources. In particular, the stated aim of 75% compliance with leash and voice control requirements is far too low. History has shown (and I have too frequently observed when hiking or bird-watching in multiple areas) that a lack of continuous enforcement has led to wide disregard of the regulations, even in designated habitat conservation sites (such as the Snowy Plover Wildlife Protection Area at Crissy Field). The NPS should expect full compliance with all rules, and set a goal of 95% compliance with leash and voice control rules for dog use as a trigger for more restrictive policy.

Corr. ID: 4013

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206810

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I appreciate that fiscal/budget constraints will affect that actual number of NPS officers available for enforcement - and the answer I received must be taken at face value as a spot estimate. But the simple fact that imposing more restrictive regulations across a wide area of GGNRA lands will result in many such areas falling into non-compliance. As per the DDMP designed strategy, non-compliance will cause even more restrictions to be implemented. With every new level of restrictions - enforcement efforts must be taken & enforcement resources must be allocated.

If the DDMP compliance based policy is moved forward as stated, and the amount of enforcement resources are not greatly expanded, how is this strategy deemed feasible?

Corr. ID: 4642

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208835 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: All of the GGNRA "preferred alternatives" would significantly reduce access by dogs, both on and off leash. Reducing access in this way is a simplistic approach to complex problem. If there are not enough personnel to enforce the current areas where leashes are required, enforcing areas where dogs are not allowed will be equally difficult. Restricting the number of accessible areas will only increase the pressure and negative consequences on the areas where access is allowed. This may result in a future justification for banning dogs from the parks altogether. In particular, the Compliance Based Management Strategy allowing further (and arbitrary) restriction without additional public comment is in contradiction to the spirit and intention of the outdoor areas maintained by the GGNRA. The proposal that all new GGNRA lands will have no off-leash access is another blanket approach to the problem. At a minimum, these portions of the proposed plan must be eliminated.

Concern ID: 29495

CONCERN STATEMENT: The increased enforcement required by the dog management plan will alienate park visitors, and create a police-state atmosphere, where there will be friction between visitors and park rangers. This would be bad for park relations and the park's image.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1470 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 199981 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: NO NO NO Do NOT prohibit dogs from our National Seashore. They belong here as much as do coyotes and foxes and children and hawks and eagles and osprey. Birds adapt to dogs as they do to humans and other predators and become stronger for it. I have witnessed this happen. (OVER) protecting the bird populations does NOT serve the birds nor does it serve we, the taxpayers and dog owners, who live near our parks and utilize these parks.

Prohibiting dogs from our parks will also create undue stress on park personnel who will have to devote all together too much time to enforcing these proposed dog restriction policies. Do Park personnel really want to become viewed more as police people than stewards for the Parks? Is delegating more time to law enforcement really they way park personnel want to spend their time?

Don't let these people drive the park system into adopting over restrictive and unfair policies which will further make the Park system an unfriendly to people environment.

Corr. ID: 1804 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 191670 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Furthermore I question the victimizing of dog owners and their dogs as an effective and realistic solution to preserving endangered areas, providing a variety of visitor experiences, improving visitor and employee safety, reducing user conflicts, nor maintaining park resources and values for future generations. The level of enforcement required by Alternatives B-E would be much more excessive and create a resentful and antagonist atmosphere. Alternatives B-E blatantly lack many other possible solutions that would not require such extreme restrictions to people and their dogs.

Corr. ID: 1834 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 191974 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My overall impression of the voluminous Dog Management Plan is that it represents yet another example of a Federal Agency burdening its citizens with overregulation that is neither needed nor wanted and will be costly to enforce. Furthermore, it will require a US Park Police or Ranger presence that would be oppressive. A return to the aggressive US Park Police or Ranger tactics of ticketing dog walkers would certainly further tarnish the image of the Park Service

among dog walkers; we simply don't want the feeling of a police state in our parks. Surely the U.S. Park Police or the Rangers have higher life and safety priorities to attend to rather than committing their resources to ticketing responsible dog walkers.

Corr. ID: 4385

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209557

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am further concerned that the closure of GGNRA park lands to dog-walking recreation will lead to unpleasant and unnecessary friction with Park Rangers and personnel leading to bad feelings and bad press about the GGNRA parks and will lead to overcrowding in our city parks.

Corr. ID: 4681

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210119

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Consequently, if you limit the dog walking, I think you will end up changing the atmosphere of the beaches and Fort Funston to such an extent that you will end up spending increased money on park police patrols to handle the resulting danger that will move in when the dog walkers are removed. The DEIS does not adequately consider such probable collateral consequences

Concern ID: 29496

CONCERN STATEMENT: There are concerns about where the increased monetary funds and labor needed to enforce the new dog management plan would be coming from, and if these funds would be sufficient to adequately enforce the plan. Additionally, these funds and labor could be used for other purposes if not allocated to the new plan. Commenters feel the park does not have resources or support to implement the new plan.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 503

Organization: Protector of the Environment

Comment ID: 181882

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fact, the NPS and GGNRA do not have the resources or public support to enforce new regulations.

Corr. ID: 1770

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191535

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In this time of budgetary deficits, where will the money come from to implement any plan? As a taxpayer I object to my tax dollars being used to fund futile efforts. The enforcement costs of getting people to leash their dogs in certain areas would exceed any revenue collected from fines. A budget analysis of the proposed dog management plan would show the folly of trying to enforce restrictions on a waste land

Corr. ID: 2867

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202770

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The plan is short-sighted, targeting responsible dog owners who present threats to the public's enjoyment of these areas. If implemented, this will divert significant amounts of very limited public safety officer time to what is at best a nuisance; distracting them from actually providing for public safety.

Corr. ID: 2920

Organization: Save Our Seashore

Comment ID: 203356

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: In that regard, we note that the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS)

Volume 2, Table 12, page 1568 estimates the cost for a program planned to run 5% years (Per page 1725) to be about \$1.5 Million under any action alternative. Given that DEIS Volume 1, page 66 notes that the proposed monitoring plan will be peer reviewed to insure statistical rigor and accuracy and training of monitoring staff to insure uniform measurement and interpretation of data," then in our opinion, that \$1.5M would appear to be a material under-estimate.

Corr. ID: 2976

Organization: Preserve recreation for dogs and people at GGNRA

Comment ID: 203640

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan and "all action alternatives" that further reduce or ban dogs. Justify any changes with objective, reasonable scientific studies and findings and remove the many exaggerations, speculations, and misleading statements.

In my experience, there are regulations in place to protect the wildlife at both Crissy Beach/ Field and Ocean Beach, restricting dogs during key seasons. These regulations seem to be sufficient and seem to be respected by dog owners

Finally, given the current budget crisis both at a federal and state level, this amount of regulation and enforcement seems to me to be a misplaced use of our resources. There are already many beautiful areas within the GGNRA that are off limit to dogs (point reyes, muir woods).

Corr. ID: 4312

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209378

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And finally I want to point out the impact that construction of the fence and gates and the requirement for ongoing surveillance by park police to enforce the policy will have on the GGNRA budget. I am under the impression that almost all national parks have a long list of projects and maintenance that require attention but end up being neglected for lack of funds. I am sure that must also be the case in the GGNRA. By imposing the Dog Management Plan proposed for the Oakwood Valley Fire Road/Alta Avenue routes, you will be diverting funds from other projects that would be much more worthwhile to the park and its users than the overly and unnecessarily restrictive dog management plan as currently formulated.

Concern ID: 29497

CONCERN STATEMENT: Some elements of the plan are confusing or poorly designed, for example having off-leash areas connected by on-leash areas, and will result in an enforcement headache for the park, due to confusion and active non-compliance. Park rangers should be used for other law enforcement needs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 78

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181838

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have walked my dogs in Oakwood Valley 3-5 times a week for the past 5 years. Not only is restricting them on parts of the trail loop a disaster for responsible dog owners, but I question whether enforcing such a law is anywhere near a sane expenditure of funds

Corr. ID: 705

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182706

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: it seems to me that the options provided are going to be quite difficult to enforce. But don't make it harder on the people who actually have to enforce these laws by making each place a complicated series of laws per area.

Corr. ID: 1904

Organization: Government

Comment ID: 200341

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Park Rangers are not animal control officers. They should be on patrol to stop speeders, thieves, and drunken visitors who have the greatest potential to harm the GGNRA and its visitors. I support law enforcement when its applied appropriately, and where its needed the most. Do the proper research and you will see that pets are not a threat compared to people who speed, steal, fight, and become a nuisance to others in the Park.

Concern ID: 29498

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters felt that the new rules would not change the compliance by those dog walkers who already do not follow the rules. Additionally, many dog walkers feel that they would not comply with the rules if they are instated, increasing non-compliance.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 405

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181569

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm a dog owner and walker upset about the changes in rules that have been in place for many years and have resulted in very few problems compared to the number of dogs in these areas.

Having small off leash areas connected by on-leash areas that used to be off leash is going to cause an enforcement headache for you because many people are just going to risk a ticket.

Corr. ID: 2865

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202761

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: To prohibit so much recreation area from dogs would only prohibit responsible people from taking their dogs to those areas. The problem people (dog walkers, etc) would still continue as it is obvious this plan could not be adequately enforced. It is going from one end of a spectrum to the extreme other. How about making some areas off leash, but leaving the ones that already see great use as they are. "Recreation" is NOT defined as an activity excluding dogs

Corr. ID: 2977

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203680

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would be willing to pay at least 5 dollars per visit to keep dog access to the current on-leash dog areas. I recommend you start charging.

Or, you will have to at least quadruple your enforcement budget because if you implement the suggested plans most people will ignore them because the plans are punitive to the point of insulting.

Corr. ID: 3030

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201031

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you take away the places that make san francisco dog friendly and a desirable place to live therefore eliminating the amount of exercise for dogs - it will be more likely that dogs will be unhappy and act out.

It's an outrage and frankly completely financially irresponsible and dumb for the city to enforce this new legislation There are 100's of people who dog walk as a job or a business and you will be helping to raise unemployment in the state of california and making a stand against loving dog owners who frankly are the ones who support and contribute to the park funds. It is not right and I guarantee noone will ever abide by the legislation - you will have to be able to ticket thousands of dog owners in one day b/c the owners will never give in.

Corr. ID: 4035

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227705 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Families with small children, seniors, and other individuals that are normally law abiding citizens find themselves as law breakers when they get a family dog. Responsible people will break the current suppressive leash laws if they are committed to their dog and their own mental and physical health. The high number of regular people violating leash laws is an indication that public need is not being met. Providing a better balance of off-leash versus on-leash access, particularly in San Mateo County, would reduce people's stress and encourage responsibly exercising themselves and their dog.

Corr. ID: 4075 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207768 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Further, by my observation and in my experience, there are quite a number of restrictions on off-leash use of GGNRA land already in place, but enforcement seems to be the real issue. I fear that if these more restrictive regulations are enacted, it will only be the law-abiding dog owners who will suffer; the scoflaws won't care about the new restrictions--just as they don't follow existing laws now.

Concern ID: 29499

CONCERN STATEMENT: Enforcement of the rules could be a good opportunity for the GGNRA to bring in revenue from citation of dog owners who are not following the rules.

T:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 575 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182081 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Moreover, I'd love for you to figure out some way to police the dog rules. I know budgets are tight, but rangers issuing citations strikes me as a revenue opportunity! Let's have a great big fee for getting caught with an off-leash dog.

Corr. ID: 2425 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200665 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Couldn't you make some money off enforcement, enough to pay for the enforcement, at least for a while, at least until the dog owners get the hint and take their activities where they belong?

Corr. ID: 3812 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208449 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Finally, I believe that many dog owners see citation fines as "the cost of doing business," and encourage the park to increase citation costs, especially for repeat offenders.

Concern ID: 31911

CONCERN STATEMENT: Various components of monitoring need to be reassessed. Some suggestions for improving monitoring of compliance include weighted costs for violations, measuring violations in relation to the numbers of dogs, dog walkers, and the duration of issues.

T:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2920 **Organization:** Save Our Seashore

Comment ID: 203367 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Measurement by Duration (Not Equal Weight)

The DEIS also does not acknowledge that violations that are not remedied "immediately" have more impact and thus should be weighted more than those that are remedied "immediately" ...see: <http://kron4.net/News/ArticleView/tabid/298/smId/1126/ArticleID/7904/reftab/215/t/Dogs%2ORun%20Free%20in%20Areas%20that%20Require%20Leashes%20in%20San%20Francisco/Default.aspx>). We believe that violations not corrected immediately and continue for a duration should have a double weight (See Example B) For example, a wildlife disturbance that is stopped immediately would have a weight (per adapted Table 4 above) of 2, but when allowed to continue unabated as in the referenced Channel 4 video would have its weight doubled to 4.

Corr. ID: 2920

Organization: Save Our Seashore

Comment ID: 203361

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Page 66 states that "the number of incidents of non-compliance at any zone must be measured against the total number of dogs in the area during monitoring." For example, as written, an area with 76 dog walkers each with one well-behaved dog in an on-leash zone and 24 dog walkers each with one dog with one incident of harming wildlife in an off-leash zone would achieve a minimum 75% compliance ratio for the combined area (on-leash zone plus off-leash zone). instead, we believe that the compliance ratio should be measured by the number of non-compliance incidents at any zone against the total number of dog-walkers in that zone during monitoring." In this example, the off-leash zone should have a compliance ratio of 0% while the on-leash zone's compliance ratio should be 100%.

Furthermore, in measuring areas, there is a logical flaw if no-dog zones are included. It is certainly possible to measure violation incidents in a no-dog zone, but that number cannot be compared to the uncountable number of dogs that are not present in that no-dog zone. instead, we propose that dogs observed in an area's no-dog zone be allocated as a violation to the on-leash zone in the same area if the observed violation is on-leash and if the no-dog violation is off-leash, then allocated as a violation to the off-leash zone in the same area

Corr. ID: 2920

Organization: Save Our Seashore

Comment ID: 203366

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Measurement by Dog Walkers (Not Dogs) as Denominator

Page 66 states that "the number of incidents of non-compliance at any zone must be measured against the total number of dogs in the area during monitoring, We believe page 66 should use the number of dog-walkers (not the number of dogs) as the denominator in the compliance ratio. Dogs do not commit violations; the dog-walker commits the violation by not properly supervising their dog. (See Example A).

Measurement by Dog Walkers Monitored (Not Total Dog walkers) as Denominator

There is a problem if the total dog walkers observed are not fully observed through the visit to assess violations, for example, if there is a careful count of dog-walkers entering a ROLA, but then half of them walk out of sight of the monitors and thus only the visible half are monitored for violation, then the compliance ratio will have its dominator incorrectly inflated by 100%. Similarly if the Monitoring Team counts 100% of the dog-walkers but then is able to carefully monitor only half for possible violations, with the other half monitored for only a few minutes...then the denominator will be again be incorrectly inflated. The correct denominator should be the total number of dog walkers whose actions were monitored for violations over a reasonable period of time.

Corr. ID: 2920

Organization: Save Our Seashore

Comment ID: 203363

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Measurement by Incident (Not Dogs or Dog Walkers) as Numerator

Page 64 states that the program measures "the percentage of total dogs / dog walkers observed during the previous 12 months not in compliance with the regulations. Page 64's definition does not specify dogs vs. dog walker and thus results could vary by 600% when "total dogs" are uses as the numerator vs. "total dog walkers" (each with 6 dogs). In contrast, page 66 states that "the number of incidents of non-compliance at any zone must be measured against the total number of dogs in the area during monitoring. We believe page 66 is correct in using incidents as the numerator (see Example A)

Corr. ID: 2920

Organization: Save Our Seashore

Comment ID: 203358

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: The 75% over-all compliance threshold is justified when "the benefits in allowing the use is outweighed by the NPS administrative burden required to manage the use." (DEIS Vol 1, pg 67). However, this overall 75% threshold ignores the every-day reality that limited administrative costs are necessarily prioritized as appropriate to the nature of the violation. The potential for more serious violations will necessarily received more administrative attention and thus should mandate a higher compliance threshold threshold to balance the higher administrative cost. We do not believe, for example, that it is reasonable to assume that an equal amount of administrative cost should be assigned to educating and enforcing a 75% compliance with 36 CFR 2.15 (a) (5) (Pet Excrement) as would be assigned to attaining a 75% compliance with 36 CFR 2.2 (a) (2) (Disturbance of Threatened and Endangered Species). We thus propose weighted violations that defacto prioritize compliance thresholds that average 75% but range from low to high, with Disturbance to Threatened and Endangered Species as the highest priority, and Disturbance and Damage to Wildlife and Vegetation as next highest priority.

PO5000 - Park Operations: Impacts

There are no comments for PO5000

PP1100 - Pedro Point: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29280

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters supported the preferred alternative at Pedro Point. The on-leash restrictions would limit off-leash dog activity on the beach, and prevent owners from failing to notice and remove dog waste at the site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3858 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208906 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Pedro Point, Pacifica CA

I support the Preferred Alternative. This year, I saw more than one pet owner come to the beach, let the dog run and relieve itself. One person picked up after the dog, the other did not. This should not be permitted.

PP1200 - Pedro Point: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29282

CONCERN STATEMENT: Off-leash dog walking should be preserved on Pedro Point trails.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2286 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201163 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 3. Pedro Point. Should be off leash. Great trail for dogs - you don't even have a trail for leashed dogs in your proposal.

Concern ID: 31834

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters oppose the preferred alternative because it will restrict dog walking to a trail along a highway with no parking. It will also limit trail access from visitors in the adjacent neighborhood.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4641 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208817 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I live in Pedro Point in Pacifica, and my husband and I currently use the Pedro Point Headlands to walk our dog almost every day. ' We have a neighborhood trail that connects with our property, so we can access the headlands from our front door. If the new plan is adopted, there will be only a short bit of trail where dogs can be walked (not long enough for a good dog "walk). This trail is right along the highway and has no parking area associated with it. The main attraction of our headlands is the spectacular view, but this trail comes nowhere near the view-all you can see from it is the highway! If dogs are banned from the rest of the headlands, Pedro Point residents will likely be forced to use their cars to take their dogs somewhere else to walk them, not a good development for the earth.

The Pedro Point Headlands have been severely damaged through years of heavy motorcycle use and are now undergoing habitat restoration. We consider ourselves stewards in this on-going important project and help to keep an eye on it through our daily walks. Motorcyclists are still invading the area, and we try to talk to them to let them know that they are no longer allowed on the headlands. We also report them to the people in charge of the restoration, as they have requested, so they can have a record of what is occurring on the headlands. If dogs are severely restricted on the headlands, we will no longer be able to provide this service, as we will have to take our dog elsewhere to get her a decent walk.

PP1300 - Pedro Point: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29281

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support alternative A, the no-action alternative because the site is well suited for on-leash and off-leash dog recreation.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1918 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192600 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Sweeney Ridge + Pedro Point Headlands and Fort Funston are ideal for on-leash + off-leash dogs. Don't change the current land use plan.

Corr. ID: 4385 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209561 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Recognizing that improving Crissy Field and other GGNRA lands is a continuous and collaborative process, I do support some of the modifications presented in the proposals provided that these modifications are made to the Existing Alternative. For example, I am in favor of an on-leash policy for dogs in all parking areas. However, after much consideration and review of the very large amount of material, and with the addition of on-leash rules for parking areas, I support Alternative A, the No Action alternative for Crissy Field, Fort Funston and Baker Beach. Additionally, I also include the "New Lands" areas (such as Cattle Hill, Sweeney Ridge, Mori Point, Pedro Point and Milagra Ridge and Rancho Corral de Tierra) in San Mateo county in my comments and support that these areas be open to generous on-leash (parking areas and other truly environmentally sensitive areas where people, horses and bikers are also restricted) and off-leash dog walking as well.

Concern ID: 29284
CONCERN STATEMENT: Pedro Point should be considered under new lands, since the park is unfamiliar with the site.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3059 **Organization:** Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Comment ID: 201239 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I think that the Pedro Point prescriptions were based on very little information, as the park is currently relatively unfamiliar with the trail systems and resource issues at this site. I propose that the park revoke this prescription and consider the site a "New Land" and follow the prescription provided for such areas.

PP1400 - Pedro Point: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29287
CONCERN STATEMENT: Site Access - Many of the trails at Pedro Point are good for both on- and off-leash dog walking. The maps from the Pacifica Land Trust should be analyzed in the creation of trails in Pedro Point. The new plan is not satisfactory because it would restrict visitors from enjoying many of the trails in Pedro Point with their dogs, and removes access points to many of their nearby neighborhoods. This means residents of the area would need to drive to the trail access, and would have to go elsewhere if they wanted to bring dogs. The addition of certain trails such as South Ridge Trail, Bluff Trail, North Ridge Trail, Middle Ridge, and Arroyo Trail would allow access to the site from the surrounding neighborhoods, and other access points.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4511 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209502 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Thus, we were dismayed when we saw the proposed preferred alternative for the Pedro Point Headlands that would allow on-leash dog-walking on only a small portion of the PPH trail system located next to Highway 1. There are several neighborhood trail access points to the PPH lands, one at the top of Grand Avenue where we live and another on Olympian Way. Those access points do not connect to the PPH anywhere near the GGNRA-designated dog-walking trail, however. To access the GGNRA-designated trail, almost all residents of the Pedro Point district of Pacifica would need to get in their cars and drive to the designated trail to walk their dogs or drive elsewhere to walk their dogs, which would contribute further to traffic congestion (already a problem on Highway 1) and cause harm to the environment through pollution. Also, there is no parking area near the GGNRA's designated dog walking trail. One wonders if trail users would park illegally and/or dangerously near the trail entrance. Finally, because the GGNRA-designated trail for dog-walking in the PPH is so close to the highway as to be unpleasant and because no nearby parks are dog walker-friendly, I expect that most Pedro Point residents with dogs, including us, would drive down the coast (e.g. Montara or beyond) to find a place to walk our dogs.
Corr. ID: 4511 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209503 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Consequently, I would like to recommend that the GGNRA recast its dog-walking plan for the PPH to permit dog walking on the South Ridge Trail, Bluff Trail, North Ridge Trail, Middle Ridge, and the Arroyo Trail. This change would enable Pedro Point neighborhood residents who walk dogs to access the PPH lands on foot, without having to drive to a single trail head near Highway 1. Moreover, this change would also allow dog walkers to make a loop within the PPH trail system (as a general policy, I recommend that all GGNRA parks have loop trails where dog walkers are able to make a loop).
Corr. ID: 4641 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208811 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The new plan is especially restrictive for the trails on Mori Point, Sweeney Ridge, and Pedro Point, all where I live, in Pacifica. They are so restrictive as to keep people from enjoying the best parts of these three parks. You could not reach Mori Point itself with your dog, nor could you enjoy the views from Sweeney Ridge dr Pedro Point. In fact, for the latter two parks, it would not be worth visiting' with your dog, since you could not access the best parts.. This is a shame, since they are all beautiful parks, with very nice trails on which to take a dog for a walk.

Corr. ID: 4688 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210093 **Organization Type:** State Government

Representative Quote: Pedro Point:

Map 20C was lacking detailed trail maps making it difficult to evaluate these options. The GGNRA has access to the publically vetted trails map that was created through a cooperative effort of the Pacifica Land Trust and the National Park Service. We suggest incorporating the trails map from that effort as a starting place for discussion of possible on-leash dog access on Pedro Point. It seems reasonable to assume that as soon as the Devils Slide tunnel is open and the segment of Highway 1 between the two portals is abandoned and turned over to public foot and bicycle access, Pedro Point will become a popular destination. If that is a valid assumption, the public will seek access to the site with their dogs. We suggest adding the proposed trail network from the Pacifica Land Trust grant effort to more definitively establish what forms of dog access might be possible in advance of the actual transfer to the GGNRA (which has been pending for many years). It seems reasonable to consider on-leash access from the old parking area up the south ridge, north to the middle ridge, and then back to the east via the ridge or the valley trail between those two ridges.

PS1000 - Comment Regarding Public Scoping Process

Concern ID: 29511

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Commenters were disappointed that public hearings were not held on the plan/EIS. Some commenters assumed that a public hearing is required under NEPA.

Corr. ID: 1105 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192289 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am disappointed that the open house format was used instead of an open forum. I feel that without vocalizing in public, my concerns will not be heard.

I support keeping the rules as they are now.Do not impose new rules or laws.

Leave GGNRA dogs alone!

Corr. ID: 1652 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191047 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Under NEPA, you need to hold a public hearing, which this meeting (3/7 - Ft. Maston) is not!

Dogs are already limited to les than 1% of GGNRA lands. To restrict them more is an outrage. The Preferred Alternative in the EIS should not be adopted. If anything off-leash areas should be expanded.

Concern ID: 29512

CONCERN

Some commenters were not aware of the public meetings. Other commenters stated

STATEMENT:

that further meetings never occurred in Montara. The Montara Dog Group was not contacted about providing comment on the plan. Marin County felt like it was left out of the process. The Crissy Field Dog Group stated that they wanted more response from the Superintendent on their comments. Decisions regarding New Lands (i.e., Rancho Lands) was made without input from local dog walkers violating U.S. vs. Barton. Some stated that the DEIS was not well publicized. The meetings were only held during work hours. There was lack of signage announcing the comment period.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 696

Organization: Montara Dog Group

Comment ID: 182686

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Park service representatives replied that no official responses could be made until the Dog Management Plan was released. Further meetings were promised; yet, no meetings have occurred. Apparently the official NPS response has been to lump the Rancho in the New Lands category and ban dog access with Alternative D, essentially ignoring the input of a large percentage of the local community that regularly uses the Rancho.

Corr. ID: 1257

Organization: Montara Dogs

Comment ID: 194954

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And as for public involvement, our community has been purposely ignored in this process. There was one public meeting, which I attended, a year ago in Montara. MANY dog owners attended -- it was amazing the large turn-out -- to voice community concerns and desires. But Park Service representatives refused to address the concerns of dog owners, referring us to the dog management plan and draft EIS under development .

Further meetings were promised; yet, no further public meetings have been held in our area. And the Montara Dog Group has never been contacted for input to the plan.

Corr. ID: 1812

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191795

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposal to change the off leash regulations at various sites throughout the GGNRA has not been well-publicized. I take my dog to Crissy Field once a week when I work in San Francisco and there are no notices posted about this proposal. I have no idea if it has been posted at any of the other sites affected by the proposal, but I have asked friends who use Rodeo Beach, and they knew nothing about the proposed changes.

Corr. ID: 4601

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209944

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Two specific areas of the Rancho tract have historically been used as off-leash dogwalking areas. Area One is a tract bounded on the north by the Rancho stables and cultivated fields, on the west by the wetlands mandated as a part of the Devil's Slide Tunnel Project, and on the south and east by the unincorporated community of Montara. Area Two is the area accessed through Princeton-by-the-Sea a development within El Granada) and extending south and north behind that community. Maps of these areas have been submitted by other persons making comments.

These areas represent less than 5% of the Rancho lands.

The GGNRA "preferred alternative" is to ban dogs from Areas One and Two, along with the remaining areas of Rancho. This decision was reached without any input whatsoever from local dogwalkers. This decision was also reached without any supporting data as to current uses or environmental evaluations whatsoever. This is an abuse of GGNRA's rule-making powers.

The lack of consultation with local dogwalkers contrasts starkly with the deference accorded horseback riders using the same areas. Horseback riders were consulted early in the transfer process, and their comments acted upon before any decisions were made as to the stable areas and riding trails. The contrast strongly suggests a decision to avoid consultation with area dogwalkers. This is an intentional violation of the law as interpreted by US v. Barton.

Corr. ID: 4712

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209788

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Under NEPA, any persons, groups or organizations are encouraged to "consult" with the lead agency (GGNRA) regarding their concerns and suggestions about the DEIS. Crissy Field Dog Group (CFDG) did speak with Frank Dean about having people/groups come and meet with him and GGNRA staff after the May 30th deadline and have an opportunity to explain their written comments. To date, Mr. Dean has not responded to this constructive suggestion to CFDG.

Concern ID:

29513

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Input from the local communities should have been incorporated before the DEIS was released. If the public was involved sooner in the process, then there would be less controversy on the DEIS.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 504

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181893

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I was very upset to see that GGNRA has decided, without inputs from the local community (other than one meeting at Farallone View where the majority of the people spoke overwhelmingly in favor of allowing dog access), to ban all dogs from the property. In my opinion, this is not only unjust to the local community and doesn't support the established mixed use (targeting for exclusion just one group), but is not founded on research or analysis.

Corr. ID: 4144

Organization: citizen of these here united states

Comment ID: 208616

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The public has not had the opportunity to participate in the development of the Dog Management Plan. If it had and the wishes of the public had been taken into account we would not be dealing with a plan at this late date so out of touch with the wants and desires of the GGNRA main constituency: the residents of Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties.

Concern ID:

29514

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Some commenters were not able to get access to PEPC. Some commenters did not know that the comment period ended on 12:00 PM.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1485

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191267

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. By the way, I could never get the internet response site to work for me.

Corr. ID: 1805

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191673

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have tried on several days to access the plan online and to make comments there and have not been able to read the site. Any plan consideration should be deferred until the public has reliable access.

Concern ID:

29515

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Changing the status of off-leash areas to on-leash or no dogs via the compliance-based management strategy should go through public review. There is concern that once the DEIS goes final that further decisions will be made without public input,

Representative Quote(s): especially since it will be significant and very controversial.
Corr. ID: 578 **Organization:** San Francisco Professional Dog Walkers Association
Comment ID: 182096 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The Compliance-Based Management Strategy must go. This poison pill that will allow the GGNRA to change the status of off-leash areas to on-leash or no dogs without additional public comment if there is not 100% compliance with the new restrictions will not work. The change would be permanent. A management plan should not come with a built-in nuclear option, which is what this is. It allows a relatively few bad players to undermine and destroy a traditional recreational use of the area. No number of responsible dog owners will stop what will become the inexorable removal of all off-leash access in the GGNRA if this strategy remains part of the plan. Tens or hundreds of thousands of hours of incident-free dog walking will not matter. There should be (and are) penalties for bad actors and these should be enforced. But the vast majority of people who do not act badly should not be penalized for the bad actions of a few. This strategy is unfair because off-leash status can be changed in only one direction (toward more restriction). It circumvents the legal requirement that management changes that are either significant or controversial must have a public process before they can be made. Critical information about how compliance will be determined - by volunteers biased against dogs? by surveillance cameras? - is not included in the DEIS.
Corr. ID: 1803 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 191644 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: b) There is no provision for public comment in the case of a change in status of an off-leash or on-leash area because of the compliance-based management strategy. The GGNRA has already lost two court cases (and one appeal) when it tried to make a significant and controversial policy change without going through a public process. The federal courts have routinely told the GGNRA that they have to hold public meetings and take public comments before making such changes. Clearly, a change in status of an off-leash area to leash-only would be both significant and very controversial; and therefore should require a period of public comment and public hearings before being implemented
Corr. ID: 2327 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 201926 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: What concerns us is that after these hearings are over and agreements have been made about leash laws and areas, the proposed option gives the GGNRA the opportunity to change these agreements without a further hearing. How is this fair? If this is the case, what is the purpose of the comment period? This Compliance-Based Management Strategy makes the whole process seem like a mere formality to keep us dog people in line and to gain the control that will eventually mean more and more restrictions. How can we enter into this process in good faith with this kind of strategy in place?

We believe this strategy should be removed from any option that is finally adopted.

Concern ID: 29516
CONCERN STATEMENT: There is a concern about the cost of the DEIS and how many employee hours were spent on the document. There is also a concern about printing copies of this large document; use CD/DVDs instead.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 173 **Organization:** Not Specified
Comment ID: 182391 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I would like the exact cost of the 2400 page document made public and the number of employee hours involved'

Corr. ID: 4070 **Organization:** Mar Vista Stables
Comment ID: 207685 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 6)DEIS/ FEIS distribution-Why wasn't a request sent out to the mailing list asking them which format they would like to receive the DEIS in? Printing thousands of hard copies of a thousand plus page EIS seems like a complete waste of park service budget and resources. This request is recommended for the FEIS

Concern ID: 29517

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The format for the public meetings was excellent; commenters felt safe, well briefed, and very able to express their opinions in many ways. The open house meetings were preferred over the public hearing style. However, there were concerns that some commenters choose not go to the public meetings and did not comment because in the past public meetings have been a hostile environment dominated by pro-dog individuals.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1691 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 191094 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I want to congratulate the Park Service for creating a meeting format that feels safe, secure, and gives a wonderful series of opportunities to express my opinion, both personally, in writing, on the easel boards, and on-line. I felt well briefed, given much personal time, and all questions were answered.

Corr. ID: 4669 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 209180 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am concerned that you and other officials have heard only from those opposed to the Plan. I also understand why this may be the case. Public hearings on this issue have been uncivil, with advocates for unrestricted offleash dogs in the GGNRA shouting down or ridiculing those with opposing views. The result is a hostile environment in which many thoughtful individuals may choose not to publicly participate in the process. Should the Plan not be adopted, they will express their views by not visiting or otherwise supporting the GGNRA.

This is not how government should work. Those who shout the loudest should not inevitably get their way. I understand that emotions run high in this vocal minority of individuals. However, that does not excuse the embarrassing denial of democracy.

Concern ID: 29519

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

A simple summary of the DEIS would have been helpful to commenters. Expand the parks outreach to minorities by providing copies of the DEIS in different languages.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1044 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 192122 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It would make it easier if you had a simple summary that the public could read. And a simple way to email you instead of this form. The process you have favors the dog coalition in the City that is organized, and not individuals like myself.

Corr. ID: 4130 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 208560 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: GGNRA can also expand the outreach to residents of a minority-majority city such as providing copies of the Draft Plan in different languages other than English.

Concern ID: 29522
CONCERN STATEMENT: There should be oversight and transparency of the public comment process from an independent or third party. There is concern that the public will not be informed that all legal requirements have been followed. There is a conflict of interest if GGNRA staff evaluate the public comments.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3970 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 206092 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Finally, I ask that you hire an independent and neutral third party to receive, count, organize and analyze the comments sent to the GGNRA regarding the Dog Management Plan. Otherwise, there will be no oversight, no watchdog, and no credibility for any results which the GGNRA might announce or purport to use as a basis for future action.

Corr. ID: 4102 **Organization:** SFDOG
Comment ID: 208462 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The NPS must arrange for an independent entity to evaluate the public comment on the DEIS. Assigning the comments to GGNRA staff, the very people whose research is being attacked by these comments, is a conflict of interest of the most egregious kind. There must be independent analysis of the public comments and an independent determination of how the analysis of any Alternatives must be changed to accommodate the comments.

Concern ID: 29524
CONCERN STATEMENT: Consider all public comments on the Fort Funston rulemaking including the 2001 public hearings, the ANPR, and the prior correspondence generally received on the issue. Reopen the 2001 public hearing so that commenters can present their views. All public testimony provided on this issue preceding the release of the DEIS should be considered.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2001 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193201 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: -Please consider all public comment given on this issue in the Fort Funston rulemaking, the 2001 public hearings the ANPR and the prior correspondence generally received on the issue of limitation of the 1979 pet policy.

-Please contact and reopen the 2001 hearing comment by person who attended the hearing but were not allowed to present their comments. The hearing was postponed/continued based on a vote to take no action and anticipated further hearing before any action was taken. The people who came to speak at that hearing should be given an opportunity to present their views as they left the hearing based on the assurance that they would have another opportunity if action was to be taken.

Corr. ID: 4551 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209840 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In addition to public comments provided after the release of the DEIS, all public testimony provided on this issue during the ten to twelve years prior to the release of the DEIS should be considered in developing alternatives.

Concern ID: 29525
CONCERN STATEMENT: There is a concern that many of the comments were from people who are not from the Bay area. Comments from stakeholders located outside the bay area should not be equally weighted.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3956 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207063 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: While I understand that the GGNRA is a national recreation area, I must express my belief that comments from stakeholders many miles distant should not be equally weighted.

Concern ID: 29526

CONCERN STATEMENT: Any changes to the DEIS should go through public review.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4118 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 208515 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Changes to any plans determined as part of the current process should also include public review and comment session, versus becoming park rule as a result of park restriction enforcement mandates

Concern ID: 31902

CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters expressed the suggestion that meetings be held with various interest groups after the comment process had been closed, to allow for a kind of "working session".

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4462 **Organization:** K&L Gates LLP for Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 209719 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental
Representative Quote: 1. Understanding comments. We note our suggestion made at the public meetings that you, along with staff most involved in developing the alternatives and mitigation measures, meet with interested groups not long after the end of the draft document comment period. The purpose of the meeting would be a real working session for GGNRA to understand the comments made, particularly on the draft Plan, where you can ask questions and understand what a written comment intended. It would not "extend" the public comment deadline or provide commenters with "another bite at the apple." A few sessions could be held with different perceived interests, such as dog walkers, environmental groups, neighborhood groups, and local government. The sessions could be public; we are not afraid of access by other stakeholders to you or others hearing what we intend by our comments on the draft Plan.

RB1100 - Rodeo Beach: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29322

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it allows off-leash dogs to continue to use the beach area as well as some dog-free areas

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3703 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 202234 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a veterinarian working at The Marine Mammal Center in the GGNRA, and as a tenant living within the GGNRA, I really appreciate the difficulty of balancing the needs of different constituents, wildlife and the delicate coastal habitat. I have lived in the Marin Headlands for over 10 years, and regularly walk along Rodeo Beach, although I am not currently a dog owner, where I observe dogs and their owners enjoying running in the surf. I will always remember meeting a father of a special-needs young boy who was playing in the intertidal area with his dog, and hearing that it was the one place locally they could come a feel free and one with nature. Throughout these years, I have not observed dogs disturbing marine mammals there, and in fact, The Marine Mammal Center occasionally releases rehabilitated animals off Rodeo Beach due to its proximity to the Center and its suitability as an access point to coastal waters for sea lions.

I thus support the DEIS preferred alternative C for Rodeo Beach, and hope that this area can remain an off-leash area for dogs under the guidelines in the DEIS. I could not find specifics on whether dogs would be allowed on leash between the housing in the Headlands and the trailheads on which dogs will be allowed on leash. I hope that on-leash dog walking from housing to trailheads will be allowed, so the residents and their visitors who have dogs will not be compelled to drive short distances to comply with new regulations.

Corr. ID: 4354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209532 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: RODEO BEACH

There were relatively few people with dogs on the beach on a weekday morning. Several classes of elementary school children were there, probably from the Headlands Institute (NatureBridge). There was plenty room for everyone who was there, and if there were a lot more people there, I think there would still be a lot of room. I favor the Preferred Alternative, which gives plenty of room for dogs off leash, but also allows some beach that is dog-free for picnickers and beach games.

Corr. ID: 4687 **Organization:** County of Marin Dept. of Parks and Open Space

Comment ID: 227452 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The county supports the preferred alternative for Rodeo Beach. It allows dogs off leash on most beach areas, and requires leashes while crossing through the sensitive lagoon area. This area will receive displaced use from Muir Beach. Restricting access on the southernmost portion of beach may be difficult to enforce, and the area may not environmentally distinct. However it will provide a dog free zone for beach users who want an experience free from dogs.

RB1200 - Rodeo Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29323

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative because it does not allow off-leash dog areas in the southern portion of the beach; some commenters believe there is no science-based information to support the negative impacts from dogs

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1508 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191412 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not change the current policy at Rodeo Beach or in other areas governed by the GGNRA, for that matter. There has to be more space available for off-leash recreation, not less, given the huge demand for it in the Bay Area.

Corr. ID: 1568 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190776 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: With a friend's help, I remove about half a ton of trash every year from Rodeo Beach. Making half the beach off limits to dogs would deter me from going there.

The south part of the beach is almost entirely visited by dog owners in the morning. Putting it off limits makes no sense.

Corr. ID: 1784 **Organization:** Self

Comment ID: 200235 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to SUPPORT walking dogs off-leash in GGNRA. I treasure the parks where I walk my dog off-leash (primarily Crissey Field and Rodeo Beach) and I don't think the areas where off-leash dog walking is

allowed should be further restricted.

I have a few thoughts on what regulations could be added that might be a workable compromise for dog owners and help non-dog owners not feel intruded upon in the parks:

1. MOST IMPORTANTLY, create an online, off-leash dog behavior guide and then issue special tags to dogs that meet pre-determined good canine citizenship. Dogs WEARING these tags would then be able to be walked off-leash in GGNRA. This program would be on the honor system, require a fee, and more importantly a commitment on the owner's behalf to properly train their dogs. A program like this was implemented successfully in Boulder Colorado Mountain Parks and so I know it can be done. Dogs must come when called, not approach other people or dogs without permission, not leave the trail without permission, and not chase wildlife. This is all easily accomplished with well-trained dogs. Dogs not wearing these "off-leash" tags would be fined. Yes, a part of the success of this type of program is creating a barrier to entry to off-leash dog walking - much like any other type of license or fee.
2. Restrict off-leash dog walking in high-traffic parts of GGNRA to certain hours of the day and / or days of the week. Perhaps certain parts of these most-congested areas could be off-leash until 9:00 am and then again after 5:00 pm? I wouldn't impose even my well-behaved off-leash dog to families having a picnic on a hot sunny day on Crissey Field.
3. Restrict off-leash dog walking to three dogs maximum. This limit should include ALL owners AND professional do-walkers.
4. License all professional dog walkers.
5. Increase enforcement and write tickets for owners that do not follow the rules. Use this money to increase awareness of responsible dog management in the parks.

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

29324

Commenters oppose the Preferred Alternative because it allows too much of an off-leash dog area on the beach; these visitors would rather the beach be an on-leash dog area or a dog-free area due to dog impacts to wildlife they have observed

Corr. ID: 842

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 186214

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to express disagreement with the preferred alternative (alternative C) as it pertains to Rodeo Beach. I strongly advocate for the continuation of an on-leash policy not only on the surrounding trails of the Marin Headlands and South Rodeo Beach, but also on Rodeo Beach itself. I hope NPS will continue with their on-leash dog policies so the GGNRA can be enjoyed by all visitors.

Corr. ID: 925

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 191377

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a surfer at Rodeo Beach for at least 30 years and a previous dog owner and probably future dog owner. I think this is the wrong place for dogs to be allowed free or leashed. I have observed dogs chasing birds. Bothering marine mammals. I have also been in the ocean and observed dogs relieving themselves in the surf line. It is impossible to pick-up after a dog in the surf line. This is a health hazard we should not promote. I think it would be fair to allow them on some fireroads leashed.

Corr. ID: 2974

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 203674

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I work with environmental education in the Marin Headlands and hope that the impact on groups of students visiting Rodeo Beach has

been considered. We often have dogs (friendly or not) run up to and in the middle of student groups. This can be very distracting as well as upsetting for students who are afraid of dogs (which happens fairly often). It can be scary when a group is seated at the beach and a dog comes running up at the students' eye level. At times we have even had some aggressive dogs approach our groups.

Additionally, it is challenging to teach students' to respect their parks when dogs are running into and along the edges of the lagoon, after birds or surfers or chasing other wildlife. Additionally, several of our staff witnessed a dog run a deer into the lagoon where the deer then drown.

It would be nice if perhaps from the lagoon bridge to the right dogs could be off leash- that way student groups could head left from the bridge to access trails and enjoy the beach.

Concern ID:

29325

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters ask that Rodeo Beach be kept as an off-leash dog area.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 973

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191666

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My concern is with the restrictions proposed for Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, and Oakwood Valley.

Oakwood Valley: It sounds as if the major problems associated with providing access to dogs are caused by dog walkers. Would it be possible to keep the access the way it currently is, which is my STRONG preference, if dog walkers were regulated? To limit dogs to on leash only for any part of Oakwood trail, the only one in the entire Marin Headlands that is a dirt trail through the woods on which dogs can run free - under voice control, seems overly restrictive. To do so because some special species might be discovered and impacted some day, seems unduly forward thinking. Muir Beach:

It would be so easy to fence off the riparian areas, which would give dogs full access to the beach. If people want a dog-free beach, they can drive a couple more miles down the road to Stinson any of the other beaches up the coast. Rodeo Beach: Again, I see no reason to restrict dogs to on-leash only.

Corr. ID: 1021

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191792

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep dogs off-leash status for responsible dog owners at our favorite spots: Rodeo Beach, Muir Beach, Crissy Field

Corr. ID: 4386

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209564

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We've been frequenting Rodeo Beach all the years we've lived in Marin, I've rescued seals and sea lions there, released them there, and taken my breaks there in the years I worked for Marine Mammal Center. To have Rodeo taken away from my family and our pets is a huge blow. Given it is the Golden Gate RECREATION Area, I can't understand why there is a move to take these areas away from us.

RB1300 - Rodeo Beach: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID:

29326

CONCERN

Commenters support Alternative A because it allows the most off-leash dog areas,

STATEMENT: including the southern beach area almost exclusively used by dog walkers or also adding more dog friendly beaches in the area

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 439 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181685 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Homestead Valley: Alternative A

Stinson Beach: Where's the beach? - I got nothing!

Muir Beach: Alternative A - I will stay out of the creek; I like salmon too!

Rodeo Beach: Alternative A, or the preferred alternative would be OK, but better if I could walk the entire beach.

Chrissy Field: Alternative A

Baker Beach: Alternative A

Marin Headlands : Alternative A

Ocean Beach: Alternative A

Corr. ID: 494 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181850 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I realize that the main part of Rodeo Beach is not on the list for closure to dogs, but closing the south part of the beach makes no sense. Especially in the early morning, the south beach is almost solely used by dog owners.

Corr. ID: 2012 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193221 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Rodeo Beach - It's too ambiguous "crest" of beach. Keep Alt. A as ROLA. Even without dogs on this beach stats show low shorebird use due to high #'s of people, kites, football games, etc. Beaches with more than 20 people/km and no dogs still have low shorebird use. DO ADD fence at lagoon keeps adults, children & dogs out of lagoon. Increase enforcement if necessary.

Corr. ID: 3788 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 205326 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think the least the change , Alternative A, should also be applied at Rodeo Beach. It's a nice big place with plenty of room on the beach for all.

Concern ID: 29328

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative D because it is the most protective of natural resources and visitor safety.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4315 **Organization:** State of California Department of Fish and Game

Comment ID: 209389 **Organization Type:** State Government

Representative Quote: Rodeo Beach/South Rodeo Beach

The NPS Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) differs from Alternative D in the designation of an extensive ROLA on Rodeo Beach which under the Alternative D would be split between areas designated for on-leash recreation and areas closed to dogs. Within the ROLA, permit holders would be allowed to have up to six dogs off leash. As stated in the draft EIS, the adoption of the Alternative C at this site is likely to result in moderate adverse impacts to coastal foredune vegetation due to the large size and location of the ROLA, resulting in long-term adverse impacts to

marine mammals and birds. DFG recommends that Alternative D be selected as the adopted alternative as it, by a combination requiring dogs to be leashed and prohibiting dogs from portions of the beach, would avoid impacts to vegetation which may result from trampling, digging, and waste and avoid impacts to marine mammals and birds which may result from repeated flushing, barking, biting, or other pursuit or contact.

Concern ID:

29329

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters ask that Rodeo Beach be kept as an off-leash or on-leash dog area.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1074

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192206

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please let us continue to exercise our dogs off leash at Muir, Rodeo and Stinson Beaches. Dogs and their owners really enjoy the freedom of off-leash play in the sand and water. We have far too few places where a dog can play off leash as it is. Most dog parks are small and confined spaces without adequate shade trees and access to water (e.g. Larkspur and San Anselmo).

Corr. ID: 1161

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193473

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Currently we walk our dog on leash at ocean beach and muir beach and rodeo beach.

To have all these places removed is intolerable.

Funston is already overcrowded and smells of dog poop because so many dogs go there.

This plan will force many dogs into the City parks which are already over-used.

RB1400 - Rodeo Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID:

29330

CONCERN STATEMENT:

ROLAs - Commenters suggested changing the location of the ROLA at Rodeo Beach. Suggestions included placing a ROLA on the central and southern end of the beach, moving the northern boundary of the current ROLA 50 meters, or placing the ROLA north of the bridge.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 678

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182640

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Rodeo Beach:

I think that the planners got this beach plan backwards. It makes more sense to me to have a small section of beach near the parking lot that only allows leashed dogs and then allow unleashed dogs on the central and southern ends of the beach.

Corr. ID: 1691

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191095

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Because the "surfer" parking lot is being removed above Rodeo Beach by Fort Cronkite, it would be better for the future bird populations at that wetlands-to-be if the ROLA on Rodeo Beach were constrained from a further 50 meters on the north side. Preferrably, no dogs on the beach, but the preferred alternative could be improved if the northern boundary of that ROLA were moved south 50 meters.

Corr. ID: 2920

Organization: Save Our Seashore

Comment ID: 224052

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: The Rodeo Beach Preferred Alternative shows a ROLA on virtually of the beach. We do not agree with requiring families with kids and picnic baskets who don't want to deal with dogs to have to trudge to the far end of the beach. We suggest the ROLA should be limited to the half of the beach north of the

Bridge as shown as an off-leash zone in Alternative D, using the bridge as a visual "fence" extended with post and-cable or post-without-cable to more extensively demarcate the off-leash area.

Corr. ID: 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208894 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: Rodeo Beach - we feel that many visitors who may desire a no-dog experience at Rodeo Beach would be unlikely to make their way to Muir Beach. 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. Therefore, we would propose a compromise version of Alternative D: make the beach area north of the bridge a ROLA, and make the area south of the bridge a no dog area. We realize the "line of separation" on the beach would not be able to be clearly marked; however, since the primary beach access is over the bridge, signage can indicate which area is which very clearly, and would be relatively easy to monitor. We support the construction of the proposed fence around the west end of the lagoon in any case.

Concern ID: 29331

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Time of Day Restrictions - Commenters suggested allowing off-leash dogs on the beach at designated hours of the day. Suggestions included allowing off-leash dogs in the morning hours and during the afternoon hours splitting the beach for off-leash dogs and no dogs.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1713 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191151 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: have been walking on Rodeo Beach since I was 10 years old (1957) and since I was 20 I have been walking dogs there: Hottie, Reicher, Jet, Coco, Willies, Blue, Colby and Lola. I have never seen a dog fight that resulted in anything but a growl. I have never seen a person bitten. Any trace of these dogs is non-existent, and their impact is negligible.

Give the entire beach to dogs in the AM + divide the beach between dogs and humans during the middle of the day - again because by 5p everyone else is gone. At the times of year when one is able to walk the entire beach (both north and south) let dogs walk it. The entire beach is only open a few weeks during the whole year - usually winter.

Corr. ID: 2119 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193392 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Rodeo Beach -
-Off leash 6am-10am Rodeo + S. Rodeo then S. Rodeo no dogs the rest of the day + Rodeo beach on-leash/off-leash split the rest of the day.

Concern ID: 29332

CONCERN STATEMENT: [On-Leash - Commenters suggested adding more on-leash areas at the site including an on-leash loop around Rodeo Lagoon.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 957 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191588 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs are all over the Marin Headlands, often off leash on trails that are non-dog. It is too confusing, not posted, and there is no monitoring. Let there be dogs on Rodeo Beach and one trail loop, and that's all.

Concern ID: 29333

CONCERN [No Dogs - Commenters suggested that dogs not be allowed at this site at all due to](#)

STATEMENT: wildlife.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1263 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 194967 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In certain areas, where specific threats to wildlife or the environment exist, such as Rodeo Beach or Muir Beach, dogs should not be allowed at all.

Concern ID: 31123
CONCERN STATEMENT: Fencing - A fence should be placed around Rodeo Lagoon for resource protection.
For representative quotes, please see Concern 29326 (RB1300), Comment 193221.

RF1000 - References: General Comments

There were no comments for RF1000

SA1100 - Site Accessibility

Concern ID: 29658
CONCERN STATEMENT: The proposed plan at Fort Funston will limit access for elderly and disabled visitors, as well as those families with young children and dogs. The ROLA located on the beach is not large enough, and the sand ladder access is difficult for many elderly people. Commenters felt it would be impossible to access with a dog on leash, as is called for in the proposed plan. The smaller proposed off-leash area is not sufficient for those who cannot reach the beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** **Organization:** *Not Specified*
1076
Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID: 192207
Representative Quote: The suggested plan for Funston would not be accessible to disabled people on wheelchairs and canes and for families who bring their kids in strollers. In order to get to the trail where dogs will be only allowed on leash, everyone would have to go through the sandy area or the Chip Trail because the Funston suggested alternative map that was presented at the meeting shows that the paved area that leads to the rest of the trail (Sunset Trail) is off limits to ALL dogs, whether on or off leash. How is someone with a cane or wheelchair who is there with a dog supposed to get to the trail where dogs are allowed on leash? How are people in wheelchairs going to be able to utilize the proposed off leash sandy area when they can't even maneuver in it?

Beach access for off leash dog walking will be extremely difficult for those with canes and inaccessible all together to those who are wheelchair bound. The only access to the beach is down the flight of stairs near the parking lot and down the VERY STEEP sandy beach access trail. That is not practical or safe to anyone who is disabled. So in reality, someone wheelchair bound with a dog really has NO place in Funston to be with an off leash dog. GGNRA should do a review of their plans for Funston to consider disabled people.

Corr. ID: **Organization:** *Not Specified*
1379
Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

195256

Representative Quote: As far as I know, Ft. Funston is the only legal off leash recreation area this side of Carmel, with the exception of Esplanade Beach in Pacifica, which is below the crumbling cliffs, with 70 steep stairs that wash away often, and a beach that all but disappears at high tide. We're in our 60's, so access is a big deal to us. The proposed off leash area on the beach below the sand ladder will not be of any use to us. Once you reach the bottom of the sand ladder, you have to climb down to the beach or slide down on your butt, and forget about trying to climb back up!

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

3827

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209291

Representative Quote: Specifically, the preferred alternative [at Fort Funston] does not provide adequate ROLA in the areas above the beach and does not provide an option to have a dog on voice control in a loop from one's car to the beach and back. The preferred alternative requires park visitors to leash their dog for long stretches in order to access the ROLA on the beach. This is very problematic because it is FAR safer , and less conflict inducing, for a dog to be under voice control instead of on leash while traversing narrow trails and walking down the steep grade to the beach. Unnecessarily leashing unaggressive dogs can impede the experience and safety of park visitors because it is far safer for the dog and visitor to travel across these areas untethered to one another. I fear that older people, or people with disabilities, will be forced to tether themselves to their dog while walking across difficult terrain and will injure themselves as a result or simply not be able to spend time in nature.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

3845

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

208770

Representative Quote: Fort Funston is an extremely important place for my family. I use a wheelchair and have a service dog. Fort Funston is one of the few places with a significant distance of accessible paths and an off-leash area; it is one of the few areas I let my dog off-leash because I am able to travel parallel to him along the paths as he romps. With the proposed changes to off-leash areas at Fort Funston, I will only be able to travel along the perimeter of the area where my dog plays, which will restrict our interaction and enjoyment of the park.

Concern ID:

29659

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Keeping dogs in the wet sand only at the proposed Fort Funston ROLA would present a danger to smaller dogs from proximity to the surf. Having sand ROLAs would preclude use by those who have trouble walking, and often the tide blocks access to a large portion of the beach ROLA. In addition the outfall pipe will block portions of the loop trail proposed.

**Representative
Quote(s):**

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

843

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

186218

Representative Quote: Fort Funston: The beach will be available to us, but the walk down to it, no matter how you go will be on leash. That will not only be difficult, it will be dangerous. Once we are on the beach, they want us to walk only on the wet sand. I want to keep my dogs safe, and with smaller dogs especially, I want to keep them away from the surf most of the time. Also, the beach is not available to us at all times

because of the tides.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1076

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

192208

Representative Quote: Also, the section of the beach [at Fort Funston] that is suggested for off leash dog walking is only from the staircase of the parking lot to the beach access trail. This stretch of the beach includes the outflow pipe. More often than not, the tide is high at that area and there is no way to get around that outflow pipe. So when tide is high, there's more space that is lost for off leash walking. Sometimes the tide is so high that you can't even access the beach safely in the proposed designated off leash section of the beach.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4249

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209209

Representative Quote: I particularly object to the proposed changes at Fort Funston. The restrictions here are drastic and reduce the amount of off-leash area by almost 90%. The small off leash area near the main parking lot is not nearly enough space for all the dogs and owners that utilize this part of the park. This reduction in space - and forcing too many dogs in a smaller area, could result in conflicts that this plan attempts to reduce. Dog walking at Fort Funston is a long standing recreational use, and it is perfect for it. It has wide expanses of sand, with little important vegetation or habitat (even prior to dog use) which provide open spaces large enough for everyone to enjoy.

The plan discusses a loop trail from the parking lot down the Beach Access trail, along the beach, and up the Sand Ladder. However, the majority of time, the outflow pipe blocks passage down the beach, making a loop impossible. This results in reducing the off leash area even further.

One of my favorite places in the city to walk with my dog is south of the sand ladder. The proposed new rule banning dogs on this section of beach is unfair and unnecessary. This section of beach is not overly used and I have never encountered any conflicts

Concern ID:

29660

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having only limited parking adjacent to the proposed ROLA at Crissy Field, and the distance from the parking to Central Beach will make it difficult for elderly, disabled visitors, and families with small children to access these areas, unlike the East Beach, which is close to parking. Additionally, the facilities and beach at East Beach were more beneficial to those with children than the central beach.

**Representative
Quote(s):**

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1800

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191583

Representative Quote: Middle Beach ' the area between both East and West beaches, paralleling the lagoon where the few big trees grow and the GGNRA plantings have been devastated by the tides. This is a difficult area to reach for families and the old people who are out for their exercise since the only parking and entrance is at East Beach. Leashes required on lagoon bridge (part of on-leash path) and then off- leash on the beach at all times, possibly as far as the old Coast Guard pier

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2813

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

201116

Representative Quote: The Preferred Alternative does not address needs of two user groups: seniors and families with children and dogs.

Elderly people with dogs, and families with both children and dogs do not have a viable alternative in this plan. The distance to the Central Beach makes it difficult for frail seniors and impossible for families with kids and dogs to manage to move themselves and their gear (strollers, beach stuff) from the parking lot over the bridge to the beach. Solution: same as above: full weekday use and timed use on the weekends.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4038

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

207206

Representative Quote: I am also a senior citizen, 67 years old. I need to have parking close to the East Beach available for me and my dogs, because it is too far for me to walk to Crissy Field or to walk blocks from far away parking. One of the major reasons I walk my dogs at Crissy Field is the availability of nearby parking. (One of the major defects of the preferred alternative for Crissy Field is the lack of adequate parking near the area where dogs would be permitted off leash.)

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4441

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209381

Representative Quote: Moreover, there is inadequate consideration of the impact of restricting off leash dogs on east beach at Crissy Field on the families that gather there for recreation. During many months of the year central beach is not safe because of the high tides. The proposal does not adequately investigate the impact on families of having to use Central Beach year round rather than east beach. There is also no science based explanation for moving off leash dogs off east beach. Please evaluate these alternatives and impacts.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4563

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209783

Representative Quote: Further, my husband is disabled and cannot walk far. Your proposed alternative allows dogs in areas that are far away from the parking and restrooms. If you adopt this alternative we will not be able to go to Crissy Field any longer when we are walking our friend's dogs.

Concern ID:

29662

CONCERN STATEMENT:

The substrates found at the ROLAs on Crissy Field are not suitable for use by those with disabilities; sand is difficult to navigate for unsteady walkers and those in wheelchairs, and the grass on the airfield is uneven.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

4037

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

207193

Representative Quote: The proposed off leash beach area is not easily accessible as is the main beach. For the past couple of years I've had difficulty walking on the sand on

several occasions due to physical limitations, and having to walk out to the proposed off-leash area is simply not possible for me in many instances. I can't help but to wonder what legally disabled people are supposed to do to get down to that part of the beach. I realize dogs can go off leash on the grass, which is more accessible. However, my dog has a bad shoulder that does not bother him when he runs on the sand, but becomes a problem on the grass area.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4038

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

207212

Representative Quote: Moreover, the GGNRA's preferred alternative for Crissy Field would severely and unfairly penalize senior citizens and those who rely on using the East Beach because of its abundant nearby parking and its ideal environment for exercising their dogs. The GGNRA should not, and cannot realistically, expect us to use only the western beach for walking on the beach and exercising our dogs off leash. That beach is essentially inaccessible due to the great distance away of available parking. The GGNRA should not expect senior (or disabled) citizens to park on the other side of the street and then have to walk all the way across the grassy area just to get to the beach where our dogs can chase balls in the surf and walk with us in the sand. Because of the uneven terrain and hidden holes in the field, the grassy areas is also dangerous for dogs to run on, and for humans to walk on. Because of this danger, that grassy field is ABSOLUTELY NOT a feasible solution for exercising dogs off leash.

Concern ID:

29665

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Issues for handicapped users are not addressed at Mori Point. Cutting off the trail from Pollywog Path (the trail running north from Old Mori Road) would cut off access to the adjacent neighborhood, limiting access to many elderly people and young children. Lishumsha Trail is particularly smooth, making it a good access trail for disabled visitors.

For other representative quotes, please see Concern 29275 (MP1200), Comment 202345 and Concern 29272 (MP1400), Comment 191130.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1924

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

192260

Representative Quote: Please leave Mori Point as it is (Alt. "A").

Handicap issues - not addressed!

No off-leash reasonable walking in San Mateo Count!

Concern ID:

29667

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters questioned whether the proposed plan was in accordance with ADA standards, and noted that it did not accommodate disabled users. Handicapped visitors need to have ample space where they can easily access off-leash areas for recreation with their dogs. These visitors need to have good trails and areas to recreate and exercise with their dogs. Popular areas for handicapped individuals include Milagra Ridge, Fort Funston, and Fort Mason .

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2039

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

193279

Representative Quote: I have not seen any references (in th report) that GGRNA have for people (w/dogs) who have limited mobility (ADA). The map indicates the walkways are further away on the new plan.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
2106

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

193364

Representative Quote: Off leash access fo the disabled access trails is critical to dog owning persons with some key access difficulties, where the individual has a well trained dogs that is necessary for enjoyment of the person on the walks and for safety reasons.

Corr. ID: Organization: Save Off Leash, SFDOG, Sierra Club, Native Plant Society
4218

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

208916

Representative Quote: The GGNRA states that the disabled are afraid of dogs. However, many of the people who use these areas are there because of disabilities. People with diabetes, arthritis, and depression walk to keep their conditions under control. People with mobility problems go to Milagra, Funston, Fort Mason and other places because they can recreate more easily with their dogs on the paved surfaces. People with service dogs go to these areas so that their hard-working dogs can take a needed break.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
4416

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

207196

Representative Quote: There is absolutely no way any disabled senior could manage the steps down to the [Fort funston] beach with a leashed dog. Well, there is no way we could manage the steps without a dog, as the stairs are inaccessible to any of us who have trouble walking. You can take a cane, walker, or wheel chair along the path at Fort Funston, as many of us do, but a walker or wheel chair can not go up and down stairs. I don't know what the ADA requirements are for a public park, but Funston is currently accessible as it is now, and will be completely inaccessible if the plans change as proposed.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*
4486

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

209403

Representative Quote: As an individual with limited mobility, I must point out that the plan discriminates against handicapped dog owners, and is thus in violation of the ADA.

Corr. ID: Organization: Senior, Half Moon Bay High School
4570

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:

209844

Representative Quote: The proposal also ignores the needs of dog owners with limited transportation options or with special needs. People should have the ability to walk dogs off leash in areas close to their homes. This proposed plan would limit access to an entire class of people who have few other options and depend on the current off leash areas to keep their dogs exercised and healthy.

Concern ID: 29668
CONCERN STATEMENT: Disabled visitors, particularly those with stability concerns, noted that it was very difficult to find areas where they could access the park without off-leash dogs. The preferred alternative would open up more areas of the park to those with disabilities, and would comply with the ADA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID: Organization:** *Not Specified*
 2039
Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:
 193280
Representative Quote: WRT People of limited mobility: I recently had a stroke. It was very difficult to find a park free of dogs off leash where I could walk (unsteadily) with safety. Park are for people first (well or sick).
Corr. ID: Organization: GGNPC
 2167
Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual
ID:
 200592
Representative Quote: I would like to speak in favor of the GGNRA's preferred alternative in its draft DMP.
 The preferred alternative will make it possible for my son to visit portions of GGNRA lands where off leash dog use is currently allowed that we have never been able to visit. Such a change in land use management is fully consistent with and in fact mandated by federal law including but not limited to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

SB1100 - Stinson Beach: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29377
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative C, the Preferred Alternative to protect visitor safety.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 735 **Organization:** Physician
Comment ID: 182715 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I treat 100 dog bites a year in my job as Division Chief of Plastic Surgery at Oakland Children's Hospital. I've treated dog bite injuries in children from Stinson Beach and Mill Valley as well as from all over the Bay Area. I live in Mill Valley and and we have dogs and children. I'm in favor of the new tighter restrictions because a sizeable portion of dog owners ignore the rules with regard to leashes and voice control at Stinson or in the NPS put children in danger of sudden, severe injuries.
Corr. ID: 1320 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195065 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: My comments are with regard to Muir and Stinson beaches as these are the locations my family visits and tries to enjoy. I would like to go on record stating that I would like to see unleashed dogs banned from the beaches.

PLEASE.....BAN UNLEASHED DOGS FROM THE BEACH!!
Corr. ID: 1472 **Organization:** Marin Audubon
Comment ID: 200254 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Alternative C: Stinson Beach, Rodeo Beaches

SB1200 - Stinson Beach: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29378
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters feel dogs should be allowed on Stinson Beach and on the trails.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1661 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191059 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Stinson - How can you take away the whole beach!!! It is not fair that people who have been going to the beach off leash now cannot go at all under the 1st proposed alternative.

SBI300 - Stinson Beach: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29379
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative A for Stinson Beach
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 10 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181415 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: the following are my comments on some of the various areas under review.

Stinson Beach: Alt A.

Concern ID: 29380
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative D for Stinson Beach

For representative quote, please see Concern 29230 (MH1300), Comment 205586.

SBI400 - Stinson Beach: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29381
CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA - Commenters suggested adding a ROLA to half of Stinson Beach.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1531 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 190707 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: At Stinson Beach Alternative A allows only for dogs on-leash in the parking areas. This is the best alternative presented, but there should be another alternative that allows dogs off leash on part of the beach

Concern ID: 29383
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters would like both an off-leash area at Stinson Beach and a beach area that does not allow dogs at Stinson Beach.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 438 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 181674 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Re: Stinson beach - I am not sure why they want the entire beach to be closed for dogs, but really, there needs to be an area for dogs, and an area that does not allow dogs. A compromise is a real solution, not this kind of one-way proposal that keeps dog owners from having reasonable access to public beaches.

Concern ID: 31546
CONCERN STATEMENT: It was suggested that an off-leash area be created that abuts neighboring Upton beach, which allows dogs. This would resolve issues with visitors parking at

Stinson and illegally crossing to Upton, and would relieve some of the pressure from this smaller beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4687 **Organization:** County of Marin Dept. of Parks and Open Space

Comment ID: 227451 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Upton Beach dog users are adjacent residents, and those who were Stinson Beach bound but were prohibited by dog restrictions. These redirected users park their cars in the GGNRA lot, cross an unsanctioned federal area with their dogs to the county beach.

Managing Upton Beach is a challenge for the county. The county has two ideas to improve management, health and safety, and visitor enjoyment of this area. The county requests that a limited segment (to be determined) on the northernmost edge of Stinson where it abuts Upton be designated for dogs. This would create a sanctioned area on the federal beach near the parking lot, and relieve pressure on the relatively limited area available at Upton. It would acknowledge and accommodate those dogs that GGNRA rangers redirect to the county beach. This also would help mitigate displacement from Muir Beach.

Concern ID: 31840

CONCERN STATEMENT: On-Leash - Commenters suggested allowing on-leash dogs on the beach.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 841 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 186204 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Stinson Beach: please keep this as on-leash access. There are enough people using the beach that a leash-law is justified here.

SH1100 - Sutro Heights: Support Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29258

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the preferred alternative which includes on-leash dog walking.

STATEMENT: Commenters feel that the area is not well suited for off-leash dog walking.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1159 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 193462 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I frequently go to Lands End and Sutro heights park. These too are areas that are not well-suited to off-leash dogs.

SH1200 - Sutro Heights: Oppose Preferred Alternative

Concern ID: 29259

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters oppose the preferred alternative and want to have the opportunity for dogs off-leash at Sutro Heights.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3225 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 202630 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Sutro Heights. I would say that at least half of the Sutro Heights Park Users are dog owners. It is ridiculous to make this a leash only area with the amount of dogs in this park. These dogs are generally well behaved and mostly belong to neighborhood residents who have been using this park since these dogs were puppies. Everyone knows each other. The interaction between most dog owners and the other users in the park is very favorable. As an example, I walk one dog on leash the whole walk and the other dog (who is under voice command) goes off leash once we are into the park and then as we walk around the overlook and around the loop, then I usually hook her back up as we start to leave the park. Even with all the weddings and picnics going on, I have never seen a dog off leash bound

into the middle of a wedding or a picnic.

SH1300 - Sutro Heights: Desire Other Alternative

Concern ID: 29264
CONCERN STATEMENT: No Dog Experience - Commenters are concerned about the number of dogs at Sutro Heights and would prefer a no dog experience, alternative D.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1544 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 190727 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Sutro Hts.

Everyone dog + otherwise confined to trails only + no dogs in picnic areas.

Prefer Map 14D
Corr. ID: 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Comment ID: 208900 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation
Representative Quote: Sutro Heights Park - The Preferred Alternative, which would allow on-leash dogs through the park (with one small exception), amplifies the problem cited at Lands End and Fort Point (and Fort Funston) - that is, the inability to have a no-dog experience. This park is a unique unit of the GGNRA, and so provides an experience not available in other units. Because it is a developed site, the environmental impacts of dog activity are far fewer. Nonetheless, we would prefer to see a greater accommodation to those visitors who would prefer a no dog experience, which could include a number of people with physical challenges that would find it more difficult to visit other units of the GGNRA.

SH1400 - Sutro Heights: Suggest Change in Alternative

Concern ID: 29266
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the preferred alternative, with some changes. Specifically, commenters would like dog walkers to be restricted to one dog per visitor and compliance to be increased to 95 percent, instead of 75 percent.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4410 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 206953 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Sutro Heights Park ' We support the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: no commercial dog walking, one dog per visitor, compliance rate of 95% or greater, and establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Concern ID: 31845
CONCERN STATEMENT: ROLA - Commenters want all of San Francisco, including Sutro Heights, to continue off-leash dog walking and thus they prefer alternative A.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1685 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191085 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I believe that all of the San Francisco County should stay with Alternative A. I feel that cutting back the area we now have would be a disaster. There are almost 200,000 dogs in S.F. alone. We need more areas to walk dogs off leash, not less

TE2010 - Threatened and Endangered Species: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 30405

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters acknowledge that they have observed that dog owners encourage/allow their dogs to chase after snowy plovers or commenters agree that off-leash dogs present a threat to the snowy plover. Commenters urge the park to protect listed species at GGNRA; some commenters state that protecting listed species is a mission of GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 658 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181512 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We have long believed that unconstrained dog access to the GGNRA is inappropriate for the mission of protecting and encouraging native flora and fauna, and often very unpleasant for other recreational users of the GGNRA

Corr. ID: 1773 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210994 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am always surprised at how little some dog-owners care about what is left of our precious natural environment. This is even more true on Ocean Beach. I've seen the following:

- Dog defecating on the beach and their owners kicking sand to cover it (instead of picking it up)

- Dog owners encouraging their dogs to chasing after the protected snowy plovers.

- Dog owners allowing their dogs to run without a leash in areas they shouldn't.

- Dog owners encouraging their dogs to poop in their neighbors yard without picking after their dogs.

Corr. ID: 2337 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202160 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I see off-leash dogs everywhere, and that includes the Wildlife Protection Area at Crissy Field, where the endangered Snowy Plover is trying to hang on. It includes places where children are playing--some of whom may be afraid of dogs--or people are trying to eat. It includes "protected" natural habitats, breeding ground for rare birds, and and many other areas that might quite reasonably be better off with no off-leash dogs.

I think the GGNRA isn't going far enough. We have a terrific number of excellent places to walk and run dogs in this city. And we have almost no places where endangered wildlife can have a good chance at life.

Corr. ID: 2396 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202363 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please protect the unique and vulnerable species of animals and plants in Golden Gate Park.

Corr. ID: 2558 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195651 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to help protect wildlife from inappropriate activities such as that represented by off-leash dogs. These activities have resulted in habitat encroachment and wildlife harassment by dogs. it has been reported that unleashed dogs represent the most significant recreational threat to wintering western snowy plovers.

Wildlife take refuge on Golden Gate's beaches to rest, breed, and rebuild energy for survival. Please give them a chance to thrive.

Corr. ID: 2607 **Organization:** Sierra Club

Comment ID: 195536 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The National Park Service has a responsibility, and actual mission, to protect natural and cultural resources, not allow recreation to undermine it. When considering that, one would want endangered species habitat to have a high level of protection from human disturbance; the compliance rate should be 95%, not 75% as outlined.

Corr. ID: 2705

Organization: National Parks Conservation Society

Comment ID: 195552

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Golden Gate Park has reported that unleashed dogs represent the most significant recreational threat to wintering western snowy plovers and more endangered species, so, why are dogs allowed to run loose, in this fragile area?

Simple solution, is to restrict dogs to a leash.

Also, stop letting children chase the birds, as well!

Corr. ID: 2846

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202576

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Endangered species should have a significant level of protection from human activities/disturbances. This degree of protection should be in the range of 90+%

Corr. ID: 3248

Organization: none

Comment ID: 202723

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Golden Gate Nat'l Recreation Area & the rare and endangered species living there are gems that must be protected at all costs. When considering planning for this area, please prioritize habitat above all else. End the allowance for off-leash dog walking, as dogs are too big a threat to the plovers. Also, other than service dogs, dogs should not be allowed in all areas. There should be some dog-free places where hiking & picnicing can be enjoyed without them.

Corr. ID: 3267

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202792

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Golden Gate National Recreation Area is home to more endangered and threatened species than any other park in the continental U.S.--more than Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Sequoia & Kings Canyon combined!

However, the current regulations do not address certain kinds of activities which have been found to disturb wildlife like western snowy plovers and marine mammals.

Part of the intention for the park was to encourage wildlife so that people could see these animals in a natural habitat. Birds and mammals now take refuge on Golden Gate's beaches to rest, breed, and rebuild energy for survival, but this is being hampered by unregulated off-leash dog recreation in these areas which has permitted dogs to harass wildlife and damage habitats.

Unleashed dogs represent the most significant recreational threat to wintering western snowy plovers, an endangered species. Other than in off-leash areas which are fully enclosed to protect park users, wildlife, and other dogs, animals must be on a leash at all time enforced by significant fines to the animals' owners. No exceptions.

The park should provide more facilities free from dog recreation. Dogs should only be permitted in areas where they won't negatively impact sensitive wildlife and habitats, and where they don't impact other user groups from enjoying the beauty of the park.

We need to enforce the park's mission of protecting the natural and cultural resources, and amend regulations for recreational use, best reflected by Alternative D.

Please amend the proposal to provide for a 95%, not 75% compliance rate as outlined. These animals need and deserve our help.

Corr. ID: 3306 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202874 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The dog people have plenty of places to run their pets. Please protect the endangered and threatened species from the humans and their pets.

Corr. ID: 3625 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204117 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've watched owners with their dogs run right through marked areas for Snowy Plovers by Crissy Field, almost belligerently.

- One individual came out of the redwood stand adjacent to El Polin Springs with 10 dogs; they had been off leash in the stand, wondering about.

- There's plenty of feces along the trails every time I've hiked through the Presidio.

- While I firmly believe most dog owners are conscientious, the sheer number of dogs means every day wildlife is assaulted/hassled throughout the GGNRA. The Presidio in particular can look like a private reserve for dog owners.

As GGNRA Management considers a dog management plan, greater consideration should be given to the following than the draft plan currently does:

- Dogs on trails should be on-lease; it's the only way to ensure wildlife can co-exist in close proximity with dense human populations

- Fenced, large dog run-free areas need to be created throughout the GGNRA

- Beaches: some beaches within the GGNRA lend themselves to leash-free areas, some simply do not. Clear signage delineating such areas would be needed

Corr. ID: 3768 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204829 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have personally witnessed off-leash dogs chasing snowy plovers on Ocean Beach in the area where these birds are supposed to be protected (and I do know how to distinguish snowy plovers from sanderlings).

Corr. ID: 3852 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209319 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Over the years, the Golden Gate Audubon Society has documented that approximately 2/3 of dog walkers in the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area (WPA) ignore the leash requirements and let their dogs roam off-leash even while the threatened Snowy Plover is present. The rates of non-compliance are even higher on Ocean Beach and at Ft. Funston.

Corr. ID: 4143 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208605 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I primarily hike, and have rarely had trouble with dogs in the locations I frequent (Mori Point and Marin Headlands). It seems my fellow park users recognize the value of the resources that require protection and the value of sharing the trail, at least with hikers.

I often go to Ocean Beach with my young, 4-year old son and, unfortunately, feel less and less comfortable there. I can't trust the unleashed dog or its owner to keep him from my son. I can't stand watching an unleashed dog chase a snowy plover. I no longer go to Fort Funston because of these two reasons. I don't want to lose Ocean Beach too.

Concern ID: 30407

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters do not agree that dogs are affecting the bank swallow at Fort Funston; some commenters believe that human or other disturbances impact the bank swallows at Fort Funston (hang gliders, natural impacts).

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1803 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191661 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: b) Severe restrictions are not needed to protect the bank swallow. The DEIS claims "continuing" impacts from dogs and/or humans that include digging at or collapsing the burrows of bank swallows, flushing the birds from nests, and causing active sloughing and landslides that may block or crush the burrows. However, there is no documentation that any of these impacts actually occur. Bank swallows burrow near the top (but not at the top) of sheer cliff faces at Fort Funston. There is no way dogs can access these burrows, so there can be no impact on them from the dogs

Corr. ID: 2044 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193286 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs do not interfere with the bank swallows they are up to high and do not use the beach. They (the birds) get their water and bugs at the lake.

Corr. ID: 2103 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193356 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The new rock revetment has displaced more bank swallows than ALL dogs running between Sloat & Fort Funston.

Corr. ID: 4153 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208654 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have never seen dogs at Ft Funston bother bank swallows. I have witnessed many times over many years bank swallows swooping in and flying behind dogs catching the insects they kick up when they are walking in open areas.

I have seen predation of bank swallows by the crows/ravens whose numbers seem to be ever increasing at Ft Funston.

Corr. ID: 4249 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209210 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Additionally, this section is proposed as off limits to dogs because of the bank swallows, but there research by California's Department of Fish and Game that found that the bank swallow is remarkably indifferent to the activities of people near nesting sites. Bank swallows frequently nest near intense human activity, including busy highways, construction sites and quarries. There does not appear to be scientific evidence supporting the claim that people or dogs on the bluffs far above the nests or beneath the flyover zone would hurt the birds.

Corr. ID: 4396 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209569 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One large assumption is that both the environment and the endangered species "could be" threatened by our dogs. These parks are not designated as critical habitat. The Snowy Plover doesn't nest or breed at Fort Funston or Ocean Beach. The endangered Bank Swallow burrows near the top of the cliffs at Fort Funston where no dogs can possibly go. These birds are probably more upset with the paragliders that are not being forced out of the GGRNA. As with most of the wildlife that can tolerate our busy urban spaces, it is the bicycles and the surfers and the people that are strange and frightening; not the dogs which appear quite like normal predators to them. (Just another coyote).

Corr. ID: 4560 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209891 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS offers no definitive evidence, rather only speculation, to document dog impacts that would support the proposed significant restriction in space for off-leash recreation. Likewise, there is no plan in place to evaluate the effects (or lack thereof) of the proposed drastic changes on the environment within the affected areas once the plan goes into effect.

The DEIS lists as impacts things that "might" or "could" happen, not documented impacts. The GGNRA monitors from 2000 to 2006 observed very few dogs in the closed area around the Bank Swallow colony. No dogs were observed collapsing a Bank Swallow burrow, flushing a swallow, or causing a landslide in the Bank Swallow colony, yet digging, flushing, and landslides are listed in the DEIS as potential impacts, and this is used to justify a significant land use change that will adversely affect tens of thousands of people and pets.

The DEIS also does not contain any studies comparing the relative impacts of natural predators and humans with that of dogs. Significant land use changes are therefore proposed based on essentially confounded data.

Corr. ID: 4598

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210065

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS notes some studies and general tendencies of dogs to harm natural resources, but with few exceptions, there is little documented site-specific impacts to support the restrictions of the preferred alternatives. One argument against off-leash dog-walking I have heard is the adverse effect on wildlife in the area. I have seen statements that the dogs disturb the nesting of bank swallows at Fort Funston. I don't understand this, having experienced the co-existence of domestic dogs and the swallows for over 20 years. Indeed, the sightings of the swallows actually diminished for a short time after the ice-plants were taken out and before the native plants became established. I can only guess that somehow the plants were harboring the insects that the birds consume as food. Now that the native plants have established themselves, life goes on as before. The birds do not seem to be bothered by dogs. Their biggest problem seems to be the hawks and other air-borne raptors.

Concern ID:

30408

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters do not agree that the CA red-legged frog or the SF garter snake [at Mori Point] is being affected by dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4126

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208548

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The red-legged frog is nocturnal and is well hidden during the day. Field biologists have a difficult time locating unless there is a radio transmitter attached to the frog. The SF garter snake is also very elusive and stays well within cover.

I think there is a slim to none chance that my dog "may" or "could" disturb one of these animals. They would be gone long before hand at first human disturbance. The scientific community at large acknowledges the most critical habitat for these animals in San Mateo County is located on privately held lands.

Corr. ID: 4243

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209223

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have to ask what EXACTLY are the "current conditions" and what EXACTLY are the park resources and "values" that are in danger of "not being available for enjoyment by future generations"? The Mission Blue Butterfly? A garter snake? The snowy plover? Coyotes? Certain plant species?

For example, I was informed by one of the NPS employees at the Cabrillo

Elementary School meeting that a species of garter snake is "endangered" at Mori Point in Pacifica. I find this claim dubious at best. Even if true, I find that no reason for alarm. I have seen plenty of the snakes in question and I know that they tend to thrive near bodies of water due to the fact that the frogs these snakes eat also thrive there. I also know that these areas are already bordered or fenced off adequately enough, so that is no reason to make Mori Point dog free or even leash only. I think everyone needs to keep in mind that many of the areas in question did fine WITHOUT any environmental management for decades/eons, and the balance of nature is NOT going to be thrown out of equilibrium just because a few dogs like to chase balls, sticks, rabbits, etc., dig holes (which very few dogs engage in, especially if allowed to run free) run free, bark, or defecate randomly.

Corr. ID: 4640 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208803 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no reasonable justification for reducing dog activity on Mori Point since there is no scientific evidence or even reasonable correlations that dogs are more than negligibly impacting the park and particularly not the protected California Red-Legged Frog or the San Francisco Garter Snake.

Corr. ID: 4650 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227747 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no evidence other than speculation that dogs have had or will have any impact on the San Francisco Garter Snake, particularly in comparison to other park activities such as the park service using vehicles for plant restoration or patrols or bicyclists. According to the US Fish & Game 5 year summary and evaluation report at

http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/five_year_review/doc774.pdf

, dogs are not mentioned nor listed as even a remote threat unlike cars and bicycles have been known to kill individuals. Real impacts were issues such as 1) loss of open spaces to construction, 2) loss of grasslands (due to stopping grazing and fire suppression that allows for denser vegetation growth), and 3) illegal specimen collection.

Corr. ID: 4650 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209005 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no evidence other than speculation that dogs have had or will have any impact on the California Red Legged Frog population, particularly in comparison to other park activities such as the park service using vehicles for plant restoration on Mori Point or patrols or bicyclists. According to the US Fish & Game recovery plan, dogs are not a listed as a threat to the frog. The ponds are enclosed at Mori Point so it is only a rare anecdotal dog that enters the ponds and that is not likely to have any more than a negligible impact on the population at Mori Point. As for frogs on dispersed habitats, the DEIS provides no evidence of dogs interacting with or harming any of the frogs in the GGNRA.

Concern ID: 30409

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Listed Plants: it has been suggested that since the SF *Lessingia* is not present at Fort Funston there should be no impacts to this plant by dogs; it has been suggested that dogs do not impact/trample lupine plants, the plants are do not exist at certain sites, and/or that impacts are not evidence-based.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1483 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191259 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in the study. To wit, 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.) 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 (and I believe there was an attempt by the park service to grow lupine at that site.)

Corr. ID: 4583 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210000 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is real irony here. DEIS/GGNRA claims off leash dogs will have adverse impacts on Lessingia at Fort Funston, where there is no Lessingia and no record that Lessingia was ever there. But the same off leash dogs, if displaced to Lake Merced, will have no adverse impacts on Lessingia even though Lessingia definitely grew at Lake Merced historically, and likely grew specifically in the off leash area at Lake Merced (on "The Mesa"). (USFWS 2003, p25-27, Figure 1 p 5)

Concern ID: 30410

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that in urban areas like GGNRA, it is not necessarily appropriate to try and re-introduce listed species.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4398 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209649 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As you might expect, dog walkers see little harm to wildlife that they ironically rarely see anyway, just as most environmentalist see significant and demonstrable harm to that very same wildlife. The fact that we are dealing with urban parks seems to indicate to dog walkers that cities aren't the place for endangered or threatened wildlife just as environmentalist struggle to allow endangered species to get a tow hold in damaged, long neglected or compromised areas. Dog walkers rightfully claim that they have been walking their dogs in these areas for many years just as environmentalists try to reintroduce wildlife systems not seen for just as many years.

Concern ID: 30411

CONCERN STATEMENT: It is believed that the majority of people walking dogs at GGNRA are responsible and protecting listed species at GGRNA.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 30388 (TE4000), Comment 209585.

Concern ID: 30412

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree that dogs are affecting the snowy plover [at Ocean Beach]; some commenters have been suggested that other disturbances (not just dogs) affect the snowy plover [at Ocean Beach].

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1056 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192152 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have read a Bay Bird Survey that indicates the real problem with the Western Snowy Plover is that the California Gull is eating their eggs in the nesting areas. This seems consistent with what I have observed on Ocean Beach where the smaller birds are harassed more by gulls and ravens than dogs and people. I think the shorebirds are also more disturbed by the Park Police vehicles on the beach than pedestrians with leashed dogs. I believe the GGNRA is acting more out of fiscal preference than really trying to balance the needs of the shorebirds and the residents. It's just easier to ban dogs altogether than to work directly to fine and remove the minority of beach users who are irresponsible. Why doesn't the GGNRA show us some scientific basis for this proposed regulation?

Corr. ID: 2053 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193308 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Ocean Beach comments: re protecting snowy plovers: what

keeps feral cats from colonizing near important ground-nesting habitat? Could dogs off-leash help discourage feral cat colonization? The issues for protecting snowy plovers must include the impact of dog management on unintended consequences, such as a potential rise in feral cat colonies. Recommend base line studies now so future management is evidence-based.

Corr. ID: 2201 **Organization:** Little Fluffy Clouds

Comment ID: 200705 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Repeated claims are put forward by the NPS that dogs, and especially off-leash dogs, pose a significant danger to plants, birds and other wildlife. These claims are stated as fact and are being used to justify the need for significant restrictions on access to beaches and other areas in the GGNRA by off-leash dogs. In fact the reverse is true. Assumptions about the effects of "disturbances" on Snowy Plovers and other shorebirds by off-leash dogs have also been disproved by many studies like the 2007 study by Megan Warren at Crissy Fields and two other sites at Point Reyes - all NPS land. More excerpts of these studies are attached at the end of this letter.

Corr. ID: 2951 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203518 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA's own studies show that joggers and walkers, not to mention parents with toddlers, equestrians, surfers, and other park users "disturb" plovers, yet there is no attempt to restrict their access in the plover areas. As a frequent bystander in the dunes at Ocean Beach, I routinely observe people without dogs camping, sleeping, walking, and picnicking in plover habitat.

Additionally, I have on multiple occasions observed SFPD officers riding dirtbike motorcycles through the dunes and over the length of the beach.

There are much less restrictive measures the GGNRA could take to protect snowy plovers, including the use of temporary "exclosure" fencing when the plovers are present. This would keep everyone, people as well as dogs, out of the area. Enforcement that targets people who intentionally disturb plovers would also help.

Severe restrictions are not needed to protect other park visitors from dogs. Problems with dogs represent a tiny fraction of the total incidents and citations issued by the GGNRA over the past decade. Of those incidents and citations issued to people with dogs, the majority were leash law violations, or being in a closed area, and did not reflect any safety issues between dogs and other park visitors. A new alternative should target enforcement on the small number of people whose dogs misbehave, rather than excluding the entire class of people with dogs from most of the GGNRA.

Finally, the level of enforcement required by the Preferred Alternative is excessive and unsustainable. Targeting people walking their dogs irresponsibly and leaving responsible dog walkers alone would be a much more efficient use of GGNRA resources. The DEIS states that it will cost nearly \$1million to enforce the Preferred Alternative, through the hiring of more Park Rangers or Park Police. In an era of shrinking federal budgets, this seems a poor use of scarce financial resources. Existing Park Rangers could more easily enforce already existing rules such as picking up pet litter or no chasing of birds. These enforcement actions are all that are needed to ensure responsible dog walking and minimal impact on natural resources and other park visitors from off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 4021 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206925 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 8) The GGNRA has not taken any other action to protect plovers, despite clear opportunities to do so.

During the recent Cosco Busan oil spill, the GGNRA quickly erected floating

booms to keep oil from entering the Crissy Field lagoon at the eastern end of Crissy Field, yet made no attempt to similarly protect the plover area at the western end of the beach. The oil posed a significant risk to the plovers, yet the GGNRA did nothing to protect them from it. Indeed, oiled plovers have been reported in the GGNRA. The GGNRA has allowed sporting events like the 2006 Turkey Trot to proceed, with the result that at least 1000 people (more likely 1500) walked or ran through the plover protection area on Ocean Beach. Park rangers routinely drive four-wheel drive cars and trucks through the Ocean Beach plover protection area while pursuing people with offleash dogs.

Corr. ID: 4080 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207800 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We witness firsthand the birding activity and the impact humans with or without dogs have on the birds: Birds, especially the protected snowy plovers, are not at the beach 24/7, and people exercising along the shore or roaming in the grassy dunes disturb the birds more frequently than dogs simply because their numbers and usage outweighs that of dogs. Although there may be random episodes where a dog is off-leash and chasing the birds, it is infrequent.

Corr. ID: 4152 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208651 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have never run into a ill mannered off leash dog at Ocean Beach. Dogs are not the ones destroying the bird area for the snowy plover. I've lost count how many times I've seen the Beach Patrol SUV driving over the areas higher up on the beach where the bird habitats are, dogs don't go to that area, they are at the lower areas near the water.

Concern ID:

30413

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[It has been observed that dogs adversely affect vegetation in MBB habitat at Oakwood Valley and Alta Avenue.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 779 **Organization:** National Audubon Society

Comment ID: 185708 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog policy within GGNRA is in critical need of revision, and enforcement.

Inevitable small percentage of scofflaw dog owners (majority obey rules) has resulted in:

--Reduction in diversity of birds and other animals seen by naturalists. For example, see Peter Banks; Biology Letters, Dec, 22, 2007 3(6) 611-613, documenting up to 40% measured reduction in birds along trails used by dogs.

--On daily nature walks, I have personally noted a reduction in threatened, endangered, and special status species within Marin Headlands, and Oakwood valley trails. Species of concern are ground dwelling birds (California Quail, California Towhee, Fox Sparrow, Swamp Sparrow, Virginia Rail, as well as species requiring secluded habitat and specialized cover, such as Long-eared Owl and Rufous-Crowned sparrow.

--Along upper reaches of Alta trail professional dog walkers are seriously disturbing habitat of Mission Blue Butterfly by allowing dogs to roam freely.

Corr. ID: 3852 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209323 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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.

Concern ID: 30414
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not think seasonal closures adequately protect listed species at GGNRA and other measures should be taken to protect listed species.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3852 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209320 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I strongly discourage GGNRA from implementing any seasonal closures to protect nesting wildlife; 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 off-leash dogs in, as an example, snowy plover habitat during any portion of the year, the park will reduce compliance with regulations when the plover is present, as many people will not realize that the closure is seasonal. I frequently visit the beaches of Point Reyes National Seashore where there are seasonal closures for beaches upon which snowy plovers nest and elephant seals haul-out. I have lost track of the number of times I have encountered people with dogs--usually with the dog off-leash--in areas closed to dogs, and when I inform the owner that pets are not permitted there, the response is often to the effect of "but the beach was open to dogs a few months ago."
Corr. ID: 3852 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209312 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: -establishes measures to protect and preserve wildlife and habitat for future generations to enjoy. In particular, the NPS must maximize protections for special-status species such as the Bank Swallow, Western Snowy Plover, Northern Spotted Owl, and Brown Pelican.

Concern ID: 30415
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree with how the existing conditions (affected environment) and how dogs affect listed species have been described in the DEIS.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3213 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202533 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I recreate daily with my dog on POST (soon to be GGNRA) land here in Montara. By my informal count, somewhere between 7 to 8 out of ten people recreating on this land are with dogs. If you ban dogs from this area, I wonder who will be recreating here? I and many others have been using this area for 30 years to walk with our dogs. In all that time I have seen no evidence where our dogs damaged the land. I do not see anywhere in your 2,000 plus page study any indication that dogs have damaged these lands. With regard to wildlife, I have never seen a dog catch a garter snake or a frog. We do not have snowy plovers on this land. There are plenty of coyotes here. Certainly they are a much greater threat to wildlife than our well fed domesticated dogs. They certainly make their own unsanctioned trails. By your reasoning, must they be removed?
Corr. ID: 3479 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 203325 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: i have been following the GGNRA's attempt to eliminate off-leash dog walking at its current locations for over 10 yrs. now. And after 2 yrs. of Negotiated Rule Making, an astronomical cost, and 2400 pages, i'm stunned to read the DEIS and it's proposed alternative. I concur with many who have read this tome, there is nothing to justify such a dramatic alteration of the current off-leash dog areas. There is no empirical data to support the claims of increased safety incidences, at least nothing that would justify this kind of restriction. And the plan's attempt to link off-leash and leashed dogs to severe environmental degradation just isn't valid. Increased use of the parks will have a detrimental affect on its ecology...

but that's because more people, with and without dogs, are using the parks as they were supposed to be used.. for recreation. I strongly request that until you can unequivocally prove dogs are indeed hindering the mating of the snowy plover and bank swallow, and that these species are dependent on these particular nesting areas for their survival, you continue to allow dogs and most importantly dog owners the right to recreate in these precious areas. Thank you.

Corr. ID: 3715

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202262

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There can be no doubt that the park service has cynically ignored and purposefully buried scientific studies in an attempt to foist their "preferred alternatives" onto the public and to create obfuscation at higher Government levels. The same tactics employed as above were used in this NPS report:

"Western Snowy Plover (a Federally Threatened Species) Wintering Population and Interaction with Human Activity on Ocean Beach, San Francisco, GGNRA, 1988 through 1996" by park scientist Daphne Hatch.

. The 1996 Hatch Report states: "Factors other than the number of people or dogs, possibly beach slope and width, appear to exert greater influence over Snowy Plover numbers on Ocean Beach."

. Unable to prove that dogs affect the numbers of plovers, the 1996 Hatch Report argues that dogs "disturb" plovers. In fact, in the entire year-and-a-half study, only 19 out of a total of 5,692 dogs - less than one-third of one percent - were observed deliberately chasing plovers, and none was reported to actually catch or harm a bird."

Further scientific studies over the past 20 years show that in reality there is - no scientific consensus that off-leash dogs have a significant impact on bird and wildlife populations. I refer to the following studies:

. The 2006 Canada study, by Forrest and Cassady St. Clair.

. The 1997 Colorado study by, Beckoff and Meany.

. The 2007 UC Berkeley, California study, by Megan Warren.

Corr. ID: 3945

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227438

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) The DEIS claims that dog have accessed the bluff above where Bank Swallows nest in sheer cliff faces near top; pet rescues have occurred over cliff, which may disturb the colony during breeding season when personnel repel down. There is no evidence of dogs and or humans digging at or collapsing the burrows, flushing birds from nests, and causing active sloughing and landslides that may block or crush burrows with the young inside. Dogs cannot reach birds from bluff; cliff rescues are rare no documentation that dogs or humans contribute to any other factors that may affect birds

2) The DEIS claims dogs could damage Mission Blue Butterfly habitat in the trail beds and adjacent to the trails/roads; protective fencing for habitat does not exclude noncompliant dogs. However, there are no known studies measuring the impact of dogs on the habitat. The rangers did not document any cases of dogs in or damaging the restoration areas

3) The DEIS claims dogs could gain access to closed lagoon for the Tidewater goby (fish), dogs along the shoreline could crush goby burrows, cause increased turbidity. While individuals would be affected neither the population and gene pool would not be affected, and there are no known studies measuring the impact of dogs on the habitat. The ranger narratives only documented one case with two dogs briefly

swimming in the Rodeo Lagoon during 2007 and 2008.

4) The DEIS claims dogs can cause California red-legged frog (amphibian) eggs, juveniles, and adult life stages to be affected by trampling and suffocation by sediments coating the eggs and behavioral disturbance or causing injury or mortality to individuals. There are no known studies measuring the impact of dogs on the habitat.

Corr. ID: 3987

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207345

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Protection of the Western Snowy Plover is the chief rationale offered by GGNRA for banning off leash dogs from most of Ocean Beach. I, and others, have explained in other comment letters how WSP can be protected without banning off leash dogs. I won't go through that entire discussion again. But effective GGNRA management actions would include seasonal exclosures, signage and education, prompt garbage pickup, and keeping other disturbances out of the immediate area where plovers are roosting. (I have observed horses, kite flyers, runners, picnickers, and NPS vehicles flushing WSP at Ocean Beach.)

Further GGNRA could have an independent study done to see what, if any, effect off leash dogs have on WSP at Ocean Beach. The DEIS and the "studies" cited therein haven't demonstrated any adverse impact of off leash dogs on WSP at Ocean Beach.

Corr. ID: 4089

Organization: Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208365

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Draft Plan/DEIS does not address site-specific resources and the condition/health of those resources. This lack of information results in a vague baseline against which to assess the magnitude of impacts associated with implementing the proposed action and alternatives. With such a vague baseline, it's also difficult to assess the need to change existing dog management strategies.

Select examples:

- a. The affected environment section mentions California Native Plant Society (CNPS)-listed species as having the potential to occur within the GGNRA but no data are provided as to where/if they are actually present.
- b. While some special-status species descriptions suggest a nexus between dog activity and the species and/or their habitat (tidewater goby, California red-legged frog), other species descriptions do not (San Francisco garter snake, Coho salmon), and there is a consistent lack of detail describing the existing interaction, if any, between the species and dog activity.
- c. There are inconsistencies regarding the presence of species in the text and in Table 8 in the Special-Status Species affected environment, the information in Appendix H, and the impact analyses in Chapter 4.
- d. In Table 8 on page 246, the GGNRA Location column contains the location for plants that do not exist there according to the text.
- e. For a number of the analyses of Alternatives B-E, the Draft Plan/DEIS states that the area of impact is currently undisturbed. This is not the case, as dogs and humans are currently allowed in those areas.
- f. Additional examples are provided in Appendix D, "Soils and Geology," Appendix E, "Water Quality," and Appendix F, "Biology."

Corr. ID: 4233

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208590

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: No dead Snowy Plovers, Bank Swallows or threatened Rails have been found by BeachWatch during the 18 year study period. Over 70,000 intake records (collected over 19 years) by our local animal rehabilitation hospital show that no Snowy

Plovers, Bank Swallows have been admitted for treatment. Four Clapper Rails admitted were not attacked by a dog and were not found on NPS property. (7)

As of May 2011, 4.31 roosting Snowy Plovers (per Km. surveyed) have been found on unprotected Ocean Beach Central. This is about the mean since 1995 (8) and 30% higher than the median value even though San Francisco population has increased about 10% during this period.

Also, simple correlations (at the yearly level) between the number of Snow Plovers and 1) beach visitors, 2) off-leash dogs and 3) on-leash dogs are all positive (.30, .19 and .17 respectively). This indicates a positive association between the presence of the plovers, people and dogs. We would expect a significantly negative correlation if increased disturbance caused by a human / dog presence was driving the birds away and lowering their population

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

30416

Commenters have observed or believe that dogs generally impact listed species at GGRNA.

Corr. ID: 1819

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191912

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We also know that we have many highly-sensitive endangered plants and animals within Golden Gate National Recreation Area that are having a very hard time surviving given the chasing, running, and digging that occurs in areas where these species. There is such a huge population of dogs now that their impact is significant, which is why it's time to address their negative impacts.

Corr. ID: 2850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202613

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am concerned about the continuing negative impacts of allowing dogs full access to the entire area without designated no-dog areas and an enforced leash law. In the GGNRA we have already lost one species on the endangered species list, with other species threatened by dogs. Dogs are not a natural predator in the area, but rather a man-made one

Corr. ID: 3438

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203240

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Alternative D best reflects the national park values. I urge the National Park Service to protect Golden Gate's imperiled wildlife from harassment by unregulated recreation. The park is home to more endangered and threatened species than any other park in the continental U.S. More than Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Sequoia & Kings Canyon combined! Protect these species and other protected wildlife from inappropriate activities such as motor vehicle use on beaches. The park continues to permit unregulated activities that disturb wildlife like western snowy plovers and marine mammals. Wildlife take refuge on Golden Gate's beaches to rest, breed, and rebuild energy for survival, yet unregulated off-leash dog recreation in these areas has resulted in habitat encroachment and wildlife harassment by dogs. Unleashed dogs represent the most significant recreational threat to wintering western snowy plovers

Corr. ID: 3462

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203285

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I was a long-time resident of San Francisco and still visit the GGNRA and San Francisco parks weekly.

More controls on dogs are desperately needed in the parks to protect wildlife, plant

life and

I volunteered for the GGNRA on several bird censuses over a period of many years. While doing the counts and monitoring, I frequently witnessed dogs chasing birds, going into areas marked off as cliff swallow habitats and trying to climb up to the nesting holes and, of course, defecating all over natural habitats. I saw dogs going after quail babies in Golden Gate Park, as well as dogs digging up plants and barking at nesting herons.

Meanwhile, their owners walked on, not having the dogs under voice control and rarely putting leashes on them, even after their misconduct had been pointed out by myself and other volunteers.

At Crissy Field and Fort Funston, I have been attacked five times and barked at threateningly many more times. I am a senior woman, and I certainly don't do anything to antagonize dogs. Fortunately, I was not harmed.

Unfortunately, dogs can be very destructive. More controls are needed so that other living things are not harmed by them in our parks.

Concern ID:

30417

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[It has been suggested that off-leash recreation should be limited or enclosed to protect listed species at GGNRA.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 426

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181612

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: So here are some suggestions and possible alternatives that have been brought up by other pro-dog people over the past few years:

1 Why not let the dog walkers, dog owners and pro dog people police themselves? By allowing people a permit, they are granted access to the GGNRA and the opportunity to run their dogs off leash?

2 Professional dog organizations and advocates are capable of organizing and CHARGING both business and individuals to use the land to exercise their dogs at. It is a luxury, and people get so much enjoyment from the GGNRA. And I am positive people will be more than happy to pay to be able to continue to use the land.

3 This will increase annual revenue for the GGNRA, and also allow responsible dog owners continued access to use the park. If people do not pay, or their dogs are unruly, aggressive or the owners are uncooperative with the standard policies, they lose their privilege of using the park.

4 If given permission from the GGNRA, why not allow pro-dog people the opportunity to fence off and dog proof restricted and sensitive habitat areas to reduce further eco- wildlife problems in the park? The park has limited and unsuccessful barriers now that people do not know where are the restricted areas and they do not keep dogs out of those areas.

Concern ID:

30418

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[A commenter has noted that dogs can impact salmonid and frog species in the Big Lagoon and Redwood Creek.](#)

[For representative quotes, please see Concern 29245 \(MB1100\), Comment 181557.](#)

Concern ID:

31393

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

[Commenters noted that the report did not account for historic species range of the Western Snowy Plover in the Presidio, and did not include scientific studies indicating this portion of the species area. Commenters also provided references of](#)

nesting by the Plover in San Francisco.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3149 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 203977 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Snowy Plovers -

Nesting records. The DEIS states that there is no record of nesting (p.1240). However, there are records of bird and egg specimens collected during nesting season. Grinnell, 1932, identifies the Presidio as the type locality for the Snowy Plover with a collection date of May 8, 1854, a date that falls within the known nesting season for the species. Also, Smithsonian Institution collection data documents an egg specimen from San Francisco. See <http://collections.nmnh.si.edu/search/birds/>

Potential nesting site. The DEIS fails to acknowledge that the USFWS Snowy Plover Recovery Plan has identified Crissy Field as a potential expansion site for snowy plovers; see USFWS Recovery Plan pp. 43/44.

Natural & Cultural Nexus. The Presidio of San Francisco is the type locality for the Snowy Plover, collected by Lt. William Trowbridge (Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coastal Survey), on May 8, 1854 (Grinnell, 1932). Trowbridge is also responsible for construction of the Golden Gate Tidal Gauge, which began operation in June of 1854 (Nolte, 2004). Given the location of the tidal gauge, it is quite possible that the type specimen was collected from what is now the Crissy WPA.

Corr. ID: 3606 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon
Comment ID: 203951 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Factually erroneous statements in the report about the historical and current status of the Western Snowy Plover are particularly egregious. Snowy Plovers formerly nested in The Presidio and in fact The Presidio is the Type Locality of the Snowy Plover (Trowbridge, May 8, 1854). Omission of sighting vetted scientific studies regarding the impact of dogs on natural and cultural resources has led to misinformation and speculation of statements in the DEIS.

Concern ID: 31814
CONCERN STATEMENT: *Commenters believed there that dog recreation was not having an impact on the Mission Blue Butterfly [at Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill].*
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4640 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227735 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Other than the Mission Blue Butterflies habitat near the Notch Trail entrance, which is miles from the other trails, there is no evidence that protected species even exist in this park. For the Mission Blue Butterfly, there is no reasonable correlation that dog recreation would have any more than negligible impact on the habitat, particularly since the habitats is fenced. I support adding voice-control trails and adding other solutions to improve dog recreation at Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill.

Concern ID: 31831
CONCERN STATEMENT: *There is no evidence indicating the presence of Hickmans potentilla in the GGNRA. It should be removed from discussion of special status species.*
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4650 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227748 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: There is no evidence other than speculation that the Park Service that dogs would prevent the establishment of this plant at these locations with the "no action" alternative. However, these plants do not exist in the park

currently, and there is no evidence they ever existed in the park or that the Park Service would ever be successful in propagating these plants from Monterey County to these non-native locations in San Mateo County. It is disingenuous to include this plant in the DEIS at all since it is not native to the area, and it should be removed from both the Mori Point and the Pedro Point impact statements.

TE4000 - Threatened And Endangered Species: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Concern ID: 30382

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative A because they do not agree with the impacts analysis for listed species at GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3620 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204083 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Principal Reasons for Favoring Alternative A

2. Absence of Critical Habitat Protection. At the open house held at Fort Mason, one of the senior rangers confirmed that there were few, if any endangered flora at Fort Funston because of decades of urban and natural degradation beginning with the area's use as a military complex. I have also not seen anything in the NPS Report that suggests otherwise, other than declaratory general statements that there would be some adverse impacts. Yet, the NPS's preferred solution would close the entire area to off-leash dog walking.

As for fauna, where bank swallows or other birds nest on a seasonal basis, the NPS has a reasonable solution that adequately balances competing interests by simply closing those affected areas on a temporary basis to off-leash dogs or, if necessary, to any dog-walking activity.

3. Closure will simply lead to concentrated degradation in areas that remain open. The extremely limited opportunities for dog-walking in non-urban outdoor spaces in San Francisco will guarantee Fort Funston's continued use as a dog-walking area by area locals, regardless of which management plan is adopted. The NPS's preferred plan, in which off-leash dog-walking areas are restricted to the beach and to one area adjacent to the parking lot, will simply concentrate that usage to a much smaller area, thus magnifying both environmental impacts - to the extent that there are any - and the likelihood of conflict between dogs and people.

4. Closure violates one of the four outstanding values to be protected by the GGNRA in the 1972 enabling legislation. It is important to recall that the GGNRA, including Fort Funston, was originally intended as an urban recreation area. It should not be viewed in the same category as other non-urban National Parks covered by the NPS. As an urban outdoor recreation area, it fulfills an important function in allowing urban dogs and their urban human owners a rare opportunity to get out and stretch their respective legs. That function should not be jeopardized or restricted, absent compelling reasons to do so - reasons which the NPS has not shown with regard to Fort Funston.

Concern ID: 30383

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support the Preferred Alternative because it would protect listed species at GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2013 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200524 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the national Park Service's dog management plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Protecting the Snowy Plover and other fragile natural resources should be the top priority of the plan. There are already existing plenty of options for dog owners who want their dogs to be able to go off leash. And owners who want to bring their dogs to the National Recreation Area can live within the leash rules proposed in the new plan. I

hope you will stick to your guns. This is a good plan which will preserve the great and fragile natural beauty of the coast for everyone. I strongly support the plan.

Corr. ID: 2807 **Organization:** USFWS Sacramento Office

Comment ID: 201103 **Organization Type:** Federal Government

Representative Quote: The Service believes that the Draft Plan/EIS, as proposed, meets the goals and objectives of the project and adequately addresses federally threatened and endangered species and habitat within the project area so as to not jeopardize listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat. In contrast to the current "dog policy" within GGNRA, the Draft Plan/EIS appears to promote a beneficial effect to listed species and critical habitat. The adoption of a compliance-based management strategy is viewed as an important component of the Draft Plan/EIS and instills confidence that GGNRA will continue to manage their lands with an emphasis on managing sensitive resources responsibly. Additionally, the proposed measures for increasing public awareness through education and standardized management is viewed as a key factor in the successful implementation of this Draft Plan/EIS

Corr. ID: 3568 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203535 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have a dog and strongly support the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan. It strikes the right balance between protecting the many endangered species in San Francisco's Presidio while at the same time it offers unusually liberal use by canines and their guardians/walkers.

Concern ID:

30384

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Alternative D is supported because it provides the most protection for listed species (including the SF lessingia at Fort Funston; the snowy plover at Ocean Beach; the snowy plover at Crissy Field; the MBB at Oakwood Valley/Alta Ave.); some commenters also believe that the compliance rates should be higher than 75%.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3322 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202926 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Given its mission to protect natural and cultural resources, the National Park Service has an even more compelling reason to protect the habitat of listed species. For that reason, I feel strongly that Alternative D is the right choice for park to adopt as its Dog Management Plan.

I have a dog, and I would love to be able to take her on the beach near my home. But if I walk an extra mile south I can take her to a beach without habitat for listed species. The GGNRA is just a few miles north of here, and I am sure that many residents and visitors experience the same tradeoff. But they have a choice; the western snowy plovers do not.

Corr. ID: 3468 **Organization:** Nation Parks Conservation Association

Comment ID: 203300 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge you to accept Alternative D as it reflects the best solution to provide and protect the future habitat destruction of the Bay. Requiring all off-leash areas to be enclosed protects endangered wildlife that is just beginning to return after much public money has been spent to restore this area. The will of the people is clear. It is imperative you vote to protect and restore this valuable resource for future generations to come.

Corr. ID: 3839 **Organization:** Endangered Habitats League

Comment ID: 203766 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The park's mission is to protect the natural and cultural resources, not allow recreation to undermine it. Alternative D best reflects the national park values. Endangered species wildlife habitat deserve a higher level of

protection from human disturbance; the compliance rate should be 95%, not 75% as proposed.

Please require all off-leash areas to be enclosed to protect park users, wildlife, and other dogs. Limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats.

Concern ID: 30385

CONCERN STATEMENT:

It has been suggested that the DEIS does not provide an alternative that will adequately protect listed species (such as the snowy plover) and/or do not agree with the seasonal restrictions.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2813

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201117

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Why forbid dogs on the West Beach when the Snowy Plovers are not there for almost half the year!

Last year the six Snowy Plovers on the West Beach departed in March and did not return until November. I am perfectly happy, as are most dog owners, to protect the birds WHEN THEY ARE THERE. I look forward to their return each winter. The post and cable fence at the beginning of the Wildlife Protection area is a true success. Ticket the dogs and their owners and other users who plant themselves in the middle of the plover area.

Prohibit dogs on the West Beach when the Snowy Plovers are actually there, then allow dogs the rest of the time. This beach is completely underused during the plover off-season and would provide an outlet for the overcrowding on the Central Beach. Also, at the Wildlife Protection area another sign should be placed on the last post before the Bay so that everyone can be alerted to the restrictions at low tide.

Corr. ID: 3852

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209322

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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.

And allowing pets in these areas when snowy plovers would otherwise be nesting there will assuredly prevent the plovers from ever selecting Crissy Field and Ocean Beach as a nesting site. And given how few suitable nesting sites are left for the snowy plover, it is incumbent upon the National Park Service-which is mandated to protect the wildlife unimpaired-to do everything it can to preserve whatever habitat there is for the plover to thrive.

Concern ID: 30386

CONCERN STATEMENT:

It has been suggested that the proposed DEIS does not establish reasoning for the benefits to listed species as a result of stricter dog management.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2917

Organization: northstar export co.

Comment ID: 202822 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I think it is important to note that the proposed policies to restrict off leash dogs due to the perceived threat to endangered species is only that: a perception of threat. Is the GGNRA basing this threat to endangered species on scientific data? I have yet to witness any dog harass any of the animals listed by the GGNRA, much less kill or injure one.

Also, why does the NPS and GGNRA ignore the mandate issued by our local Board of Supes who recognize that San Francisco welcomes dogs as loyal companions who are deserving of unfettered exercise on open land? Our city is known as a dog-friendly community and has established a long history of accommodating man's best friend.

San Francisco citizens share responsibility for our natural lands and which are used for enjoyment by all who have come to embrace the San Francisco way-inclusiveness. The GGNRA can impose higher fines for non-compliant dog owners who do not pick up waste or do not have voice command over their dogs.

Where else are dogs to go, who are always happiest when they are able to romp free with their mates and masters but open lands? If the GGNRA seeks to ban access to areas that have been historically available to dog owners, what lands are you replacing them with?

Where is the evidence that supports your conclusion that dogs are creating havoc among visitors and other animals visiting the area? I am convinced that those who complain about dog's off-leash in these areas are a substantial, but vocal, minority. It is shameful that a federal agency is imposing its own biased views and policies against a community that has clearly expressed its desire to enjoy the lands....some previously owned by the community....as it has been historically enjoyed.

Shame on the GGNRA and the NPS for ignoring our historical access and imposing their will against the responsible wishes of the local community.

Corr. ID: 3786 **Organization:** Cayuga Improvement Association

Comment ID: 205541 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are plenty of things to disturb wildlife in a park in the middle of a city. For example when I have gone down to the beach below Fort Funston the dogs are generally playing in the water. Not climbing up the cliffs disturbing the bank swallows. However I do see kids climbing up the cliffs. After the 4th of July I have seen evidence of people shooting off bottle rockets below the cliffs. There are many Crows out at Fort Funston and we all know they like to scavenge other birds' nests. At Lake Merced across from Fort Funston where some of the swallows feed there are two very loud shooting ranges. So how can the Park Service say that removing dogs is going to protect the Bank Swallow?

Corr. ID: 4089 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208387 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Draft Plan/DEIS doesn't establish how or why a special-status species that has been sharing habitat with dogs for decades will experience an actual, likely benefit from stricter dog management, given other factors affecting the species.

Concern ID:
CONCERN
STATEMENT:

30388
In general, commenters do not agree with the impacts analysis of listed species (snowy plover, bank swallow) at GGRNA as a result of dogs in the DEIS because there is no scientific evidence connecting dog-related activities with the stated

impacts.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3679

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204793

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: "Impacts to San Francisco lessingia would be long term, minor, and adverse for alternatives C, D, and E, and the preferred alternative, negligible for alternative B, and long term, moderate and adverse under the no action alternative" (p. xxi)

On the NPS.gov homepage of the Presidio of San Francisco, the article on the San Francisco Lessingia (*Lessingia germanorum*) the article states:

"Range in State: San Francisco Bay Area. The only population known of outside the Presidio is located in Daly City. The Presidio is the type locality for this species."

Please provide substantive documentation including biology reports that San Francisco Lessingia (*Lessingia germanorum*) existed at Fort Funston as a native species prior to the adoption of the 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy, and that this native plant has degraded or disappeared as a direct result of dog walking.

I question the accuracy of all of the DEIS Executive Summary related to Fort Funston on pp. xx and xxi.

Corr. ID: 4520

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209585

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Environmental Consequences (Section on Special-status Species) in Chapter 4 is inadequate because it fails to provide adequate scientific evidence connecting dog-related activities with impacts on snowy plover populations or other wildlife populations. Are documented snowy plover populations nesting or resting, and no site-specific scientific evidence is given to the impact of canine interactions? I applaud and support protection of endangered species. But, are interaction impacts between dogs and the endangered actually more or less significant than other activities in the GGNRA. No comparative evidence or analysis of varied activities is addressed.

Corr. ID: 4592

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209989

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Incident reports indicate that dogs and dog owners are generally very well behaved. The percentage of incidents involving dogs is very small considering the number of dogs in the park.

111 Off-leash recreation is being held to a higher standard when measuring "effect on wildlife." The DEIS indicates that protection of wildlife is a rationale for restrictions on off-leash recreation. Note that there is no scientific data indicating that dogs per se have caused harm to the snowy plovers, bank swallows, or other wildlife. This is in spite of the park and others who have been diligently LOOKING for evidence of damage, and in spite of the fact that wildlife and off-leash dogs have successfully co-existed for over three decades in the GGNRA. The turn of a plover's head, a movement or lack of movement (!), is considered by the GGNRA to be an "effect." In other national parks, when judging the appropriateness of a recreation, e.g. hunting, an effect is measured by whether the recreation affects the POPULATION count.

Corr. ID: 4630

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208655

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS is highly biased and blames dogs for problems that are either caused by general park use or overall natural trends. For example, there is no hard evidence offered that dogs create a singular burden on the park

resources and habitats. The 36 threatened and endangered species that exist within the park system are not endangered by conditions here, specifically by dogs in the GGNRA as the report would have you believe, but rather by their population numbers worldwide. In fact, the small number of sites currently open to recreation with dogs (as defined by the 1979 Pet Policy) include no critical habitats or nesting areas for either the Snowy Plover or bank swallow.

Corr. ID: 4705

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209741

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The document you have prepared is not based on facts about dogs' impact on the environment and the survival of endangered species. There is no scientific data to illustrate your conclusions in your report. Humans, pollution, and other factors contribute to certain species being endangered.

Corr. ID: 4712

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209789

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Crissy Field Dog Group - Preliminary Analysis of Draft Plan/Draft EIS Draft Impact Analysis

1. Leaps of Impact

- The draft EIS impact analysis ' which in turn drives the alternatives analysis ' often makes leaps of faith based on assumptions, rather than scientific or technical data.
- The basic assumption throughout the draft EIS sections is that: the presence of dogs means impaired natural values, based on the general tendencies of dogs to root around or chase other animals. As a general matter, it's hard to take issue with a sweeping generalization like that.
- In many places, the draft EIS does not provide any data on actual impacts by dogs in areas being proposed for closure to dog walking.
- There are big consequences to thousands of people around the Bay Area for getting this wrong.
- But this is a site-specific technical planning document, where hard information about actual effects needs to be disclosed and evaluated.
- In places where data are provided, for example, there are areas where the draft EIS explains that people, as well as dogs, who traverse dune areas disturb the western snowy plovers. Monitoring surveys in an area observed 48 off leash dogs chase the plovers in 12 years. The plovers continue to return to the area each year. The draft EIS then makes undocumented assumptions that there are unacceptable impacts and that dogs, not people, are the culprits.
- There might or might not be a problem ' we can't tell from the draft EIS. If there is, we can't tell from the draft EIS whether access should be limited for people, for dogs, or both.
- The public deserves to know these answers to be able to comment intelligently on the draft plan or be willing to accept ' for themselves or their dogs ' such severe restrictions.= access to our own public lands, and San Francisco city beaches where people have visited for decades.

Concern ID:

30390

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

In general, commenters do not agree with the impacts analysis of the snowy plover as a result of dogs because other impacts such as natural predators, human disturbance, horses, ATVs, etc. are also present at the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3607

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203867

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA draft management plan does not provide evidence to justify such drastic changes to 40 years of healthy dog and human recreation

I have been taking dogs to Fort Funston, Crissy Field, the Presidio, Sweeny Ridge & Mori Point for the last 18 years. In all that time, I have not seen any dogs harm

any birds or the habitat. Yes, they chase them, but so do the kids on the beach. Dogs dig in the sand, but so do people. The studies about the plovers and other species are not specific for the GGNRA specifically and the dogs are not harrassing them needlessly

Please don't make these drastic changes to the GGNRA dog policy.

Corr. ID: 3737

Organization: SF Dog Owners Group

Comment ID: 204261

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Relative Impacts of Dogs Compared to Other Causes - The DEIS considers dogs as if they are the only thing in the GGNRA. There is no context. For example, there is no discussion of impacts of natural predators on snowy plover birds and how that compares to those from dogs, or how do disturbances from people compare to disturbances from dogs. Without this context, the DEIS cannot say restricting dogs will have a significant positive impact on species. Horses, humans and ATV's have a MUCH higher impact. Lack of Site Specific Information - The DEIS fails to document actual impacts on resources at each site. DEIS assumes that if an impact "could" occur, it does occur at each site, even though there is little evidence of actual impacts documented at each site. If the DEIS cannot document actual impacts, then they cannot restrict access

Concern ID:

30391

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters do not agree with the impacts analysis for the MBB at Sweeney Ridge and believes that dogs do not affect this species.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1893

Organization: University of San Francisco

Comment ID: 200613

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While I agree that an increased usage of an area can lead to environmental degradation, there is no reason to target dog owners as the specific cause. For example, the documentation of the preferred plan for Sweeney Ridge notes that "Alternative C protects the Mission Blue butterfly habitat and large area of undisturbed contiguous habitat that is rare and contains wildlife that could be disturbed by the presence of dogs." To point out the obvious, although protecting habitat is an important goal, my dog doesn't eat butterflies. Decisions should be based on carefully collected data, not just someone's feeling that a group "could" disturb the habitat. Walking beside me on the trail, my dog does not degrade the habitat any more than any other passerby

Concern ID:

30393

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters do not agree that off-leash dogs disturb the bank swallows at Fort Funston and/or that other disturbances affect the bank swallow (crows/ravens, natural occurrences), or that effective signage/fences can mitigate for potential impacts.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3127

Organization: N/A

Comment ID: 201560

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposed dog management plan is rash and unacceptable. Any wildlife that needs protecting in these areas are already in a national park with boundaries set up for their safety.

Birds or other endangered animals nesting atop the cliffs of Ft. Funston would hardly benefit from dogs being leashed on the beaches 100 feet below. Furthermore, any animal that may be upset by a passing dog will be no match for other naturally occurring birds, gulls, raccoons and the plethora of other animals which already freely live in these areas. Our dogs do no more damage than their natural counterparts. Please reconsider taking no action against the current rules and regulations regarding unleashed dogs in the GGNRA. Our beloved companions deserve to be able to experience and enjoy nature the same as us.

Corr. ID: 4620

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 207006 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It is significant that adverse impacts of dogs on swallows have not been observed because people have been out there looking for them. A GGNRA researcher closely monitored the bank swallow colony in 1994 and 1995 and wrote an official report. (1994-95 Bank Swallow Annual Report, Nola Chow, 1996) Chow observed that there were dogs present, and noted they did not disturb the swallows. She also listed a number of things the GGNRA should do to protect the bank swallow colony, but doesn't mention the dogs. Chow's monitoring is part of NPS 2007e, but her report isn't included in the twenty-seven page bibliography attached to the DEIS. Chow's observations of dogs with no impact on swallows are not reported in either the DEIS or in 2007e. The entire 1993-2006 GGNRA bank swallow monitoring project hasn't documented any dog-caused burrow collapses, swallows flushed from nests by dogs, nor any dog-caused landslides crushing burrows.

We should not be surprised that dogs have no impact on the bank swallows. Barrett Garrison is recognized as a bank swallow expert by GGNRA; he has two listings in the DEIS list of references. Garrison says in Bank Swallow, "Bank Swallows appear relatively insensitive to moderate levels of human-induced disturbance." Garrison lists documented land uses around Bank Swallow colonies: hydroelectric power generation, irrigation, recreational boating, commercial agriculture, vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and livestock grazing. They nest in active quarries and in busy road cuts. Garrison says, "These land uses appear relatively benign as long as the integrity of the nesting bank remains," and, "... are unlikely to have substantive adverse impacts to Bank Swallows."

The bank swallows nest in burrows in the cliff faces above the beach at Fort Funston, and fly directly from the burrows to feed over Lake Merced to the east. They return directly to the cliff face burrows. During 90+ hours of sitting on the beach beneath the bank swallow colony I saw many dogs on the beach. But I didn't see a single dog that showed awareness that the swallows were present. People who do not go specifically looking for the swallows don't notice them either. The swallows don't interact with, or react to, people or dogs.

Corr. ID: 4620

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206992 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I closely monitored the bank swallow colony at Fort Funston for five successive nesting seasons, 2001-2005. This involved 90 monitoring sessions of an hour or more each. I recorded each individual burrow on maps, noted which burrows were occupied on each of the 90 days, and tried to identify how many young were fledged from each burrow. My records are at least as comprehensive and accurate as those kept by GGNRA staff. I tell you all this to communicate: The bank swallows at Fort Funston are very important to me. I would never do anything to compromise their welfare, nor would I willingly allow others to harm them. So I do not make the following comments lightly.

Dogs have no impact on the bank swallows at Fort Funston.

The GGNRA/DEIS used deeply flawed "science" to justify removing off leash dogs from most of Fort Funston in its Preferred Alternative. The DEIS claims (table, page 1265) that allowing off leash dogs to remain would have "long term minor to moderate adverse impacts" on the bank swallows because "continuing impacts from dogs and/or humans would include digging at or collapsing the burrows, flushing birds from nests, and causing active sloughing and landslides that may block or crush burrows." In fact, there is no evidence that dogs have any impact on the bank swallow colony at Fort Funston and, specifically, no evidence that they dig at or

collapse burrows, flush birds, or cause landslides that crush burrows.

Corr. ID: 4622

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207072

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Bank Swallows/Native Species/Habitat Protection -

The DEIS claims that off leash dogs are interfering with the nest of the Bank Swallows which are located on the cliffs at the beach. While every once in a while an errant dog falls over the cliffs by accident, this is unusual experience and not done to interfere with a bird. In fact, I have never seen a dog anywhere near the cliffs paying the least bit of attention to any bird. People climb the cliffs and also fall over them but the DEIS does not include any analysis of the effect of the human interference with Bank Swallows or other native inhabitants. In addition, no statistical data is provided pertaining to the large number of cliff rescues by the Police, Sheriff, Fire Department, Coast Guard. There must be data available because the various departments are frequently present on site practicing and / or rescuing.

The DEIS fails to address the effect of the large invasion of the non-native crows/ravens at Fort Funston on the native species of birds and animals. Look around. There is not a seagull to be found at Fort Funston. The seagulls were previously at the Fort. Now they are at Lake Merced. I doubt the hanggliders drove them off. I doubt the dogs drove them off. However, the crows/ravens have invaded the cliff areas, have driven off most all of the other birds and appear to eat everything and anything. They show no fear of dogs or humans. The DEIS fails to address the destructive effect these birds are having on the native birds and animals of Fort Funston.

Concern ID:

30394

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

Commenters do not agree that off-leash dogs will affect the western snowy plover [effective signage is appropriate mitigation at the Crissy Field and Ocean Beach].

Corr. ID: 4568

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209928

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Ocean Beach and possibly Crissy Field, the Snowy Plover areas could be fenced. This would keep people as well as dogs from disturbing the birds. At Fort Funston signs could be placed near the cliffs to warn people away as those who are not familiar with the area are not aware of the steep cliffs. I would also suggest moving the trail to the beach sand ladder farther away from the hang glider takeoff point

Concern ID:

30395

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

It has been suggested that since the SF Lessingia is not present at Fort Funston there should be no impacts to this plant or that effective fencing could protect listed plant species at Fort Funston.

Corr. ID: 4583

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209999

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: When discussing potential impacts to Lessingia on page 1311, the Preferred Alternative (C) at Fort Funston "may cause some of the dog walkers to visit other locations." People will go elsewhere but there will be no adverse impact because there is no Lessingia at Lake Merced. But when discussing potential impacts on visitor experience in nearby parks on page 1530, exactly the same Preferred Alternative (C) at Fort Funston leads to, "An increase in visitation in nearby parks is not likely." Here GGNRA needs to claim dog walkers would not go elsewhere in order to claim there would be no adverse impact on visitor experience at Lake Merced.

There is real irony here. DEIS/GGNRA claims off leash dogs will have adverse impacts on Lessingia at Fort Funston, where there is no Lessingia and no record that Lessingia was ever there. But the same off leash dogs, if displaced to Lake Merced, will have no adverse impacts on Lessingia even though Lessingia definitely grew at Lake Merced historically, and likely grew specifically in the off leash area at Lake Merced (on "The Mesa"). (USFWS 2003, p25-27, Figure 1 p 5)

Concern ID:

30397

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters have requested that off-leash dogs be prohibited/limited (in the park or in certain areas that support listed species), ROLAs should be enclosed, or leashes should be required to protect listed species at GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2254

Organization: Napa Solano Audubon Society

Comment ID: 201012

Organization Type: Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: In general we agree with the National Park Service Preferred Alternatives, but we feel that there should be NO area in the National Park that dogs should be allowed to go off leash to protect wildlife, people, and the dogs themselves. We are sorry to take such a tough stance on this, but wildlife, especially those rare and endangered species 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

Corr. ID: 2715

Organization: Wildlife Center of Silicon Valley

Comment ID: 195566

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a frequent visitor to the Golden Gate National Recreation area I am very concerned about impacts to wildlife from human activity and from dogs. The park's mission is to protect natural resources of the park, not allow recreation to undermine them.

Specifically, I am writing to urge that unregulated off-leash dog recreation be banned on more beaches and trails in the park, in order to protect species like the western snowy plover. Since the park is home to more endangered and threatened species than any other park in the continental U.S. I would like to see wildlife habitat receive a higher level of protection from human disturbance. The compliance rate should be 95%, not 75% as outlined.

Corr. ID: 2949

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 203395

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm writing to request that you limit off leash recreation for dogs to areas that will not have negative impacts on indigenous and endangered species. I have personally witnessed, multiple times, off leash dogs chasing migrating shorebirds up and down the beach and effectively preventing them from feeding, and costing them vital energy in fleeing the dogs. The people with these dogs have watched, but done nothing to intervene.

As long as some people cannot understand the necessity of allowing safe spaces for other species who are completely dependent on those few spaces, restrictions must be made to protect the voiceless from the the species with a very vocal and organized lobby.

I have friends who are dog owners and some are dog walkers, who strongly oppose any limitation on their recreational activities in the GGNRA. I explain to them that dogs are not indigenous to this area, dogs are not an endangered species and dogs can go elsewhere to run and play. Shorebirds don't have that option. They are indigenous to this area, many are endangered or threatened and they do not have the luxury of feeding or resting in any other area except the tidal zone where their food

lives.

I also feel that endangered species wildlife habitat protection should be 95% compliance, not the 75% that is currently outlined.

Corr. ID: 3291

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202842

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support protecting our endangered species in the Golden Gate Recreational area, including requiring dogs to be kept on leash. Dogs can be a menace not only to wildlife, but to other dogs and to people, and most dog owners do not have their dog under voice control. It is more appropriate to designate a space for people and their dogs to play together where they don't threaten wildlife and can be avoided by people with a fear of dogs.

I urge you to take all steps necessary to preserve our wildlife. Once gone, they can never be recovered, a permanent loss to all of humanity.

Corr. ID: 3314

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202920

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no reason to risk the habitat of snowy plovers to off-leash domestic pets, when there are many locations that would not impinge on snowy plover nesting habitat. The Park Service should limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

30398

Commenters do not agree with the impacts analysis for either the CA red-legged frog or the SF garter snake at Mori Point.

Corr. ID: 3586

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 203668

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In regards to the SITE-SPECIFIC submitted by the City of Pacifica (in quotes) my comments follow:

"Sweeney Ridge: ?..the fact that the Sneath Lane/A'PS trail is paved would prevent most if not all dogs from accessing the property off the trails (in the event there is non-compliance with the leash law). Proper enforcement of the rules should ensure that few if any violations occur, in which case the environmental effects from site access on this parcel would be minimal."

This assumes that dog owners would keep their dogs leashed AND that dogs can differentiate between paved and un-paved trails and would stay on only paved trails. Would rely on enforcement in a remote area - but concedes that without compliance and enforcement there would be "environmental effects" in contradiction to their statement above!

"Mori Point: We suggest that the trails designated on Map 17C as "Tmigtac" and "Pollywog" trails be modified to allow on-leash dog access. We believe the likelihood of either the red-legged frog or the Sun Francisco garter snake being harmed or negatively affected is extremely remote?."

The uplands of the Mori Point area is critical habitat for the endangered San Francisco Garter Snake (SFGS) and trails bisect this area which adjoins Horse Stable Pond, it's most crucial habitat. Currently dog walkers and hikers access this area from three different directions and thus there is intensive pressure on this species because of disturbances. By my own casual but routine observation I estimate that twenty percent (20%) of dog owners do not comply with the current leash law at Mori Point, and that by allowing on-leash access it would encourage

more visitations by people with dogs, thus raising the count of off-leash dogs with greater impacts on wildlife. Further, because of the presence of coyotes in the area a greater dog presence would create more conflicts. The belief that on-leash dog access is without negative impacts is totally without merit and has no basis in fact.
30400

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

Some commenters have stated it is the park's mission to protect listed species at GGNRA and that a compliance rate of 75% is too low.

Corr. ID: 2678

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195491

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The park's mission is to protect the natural and cultural resources, not allow recreation to undermine it. Endangered species wildlife habitat deserve a higher level of protection from human disturbance; the compliance rate should be 95%, not 75% as outlined.

TE5000- Threatened and Endangered Species: Cumulative Impacts

There were no comments for TE5000

TE6000- Threatened and Endangered Species: Impairment Analyses

There were no comments for TE6000

VR2010 - Vegetation and Riparian Areas: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 29620

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

**Representative
Quote(s):**

Dogs are often seen impacting flora and riparian areas through digging, urinating and defecating, and trampling of plants in areas where dogs are not permitted. Dogs negatively impact native plant species, which are fragile when recently planted.

Corr. ID: Organization: Mattingly Landscape Co

2209

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200729

Representative Quote: All it takes to kill a small, delicate plant is the urine, feces, or trampling of one dog. When that is multiplied by hundreds or thousands of visitors per week then it comes as some surprise to me that dogs are allowed in areas such as the Presidio at all

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2262

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

201028

Representative Quote: I also think the negative impact of dogs to our environment is not limited to damage they may cause to the plants and animals living in the area but because of the vast amounts of waste they produce regardless of whether the owners pick it up or not.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

3961

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

206064

Representative Quote: Dog feces make the park feel unsanitary, and have an impact on other species, such as butterflies, that are live their lives by their sense of smell. They change the chemistry of the soil which can effect plant populations.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4004

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

206262

Representative Quote: On the same hike we saw a dog tearing back and forth in this sandy area where it looked like native plants had been planted, or were at least struggling to establish themselves. If we want these areas to remain beautiful for many years to come, we need to allow the habitat restoration being done time to take hold, and when dogs are running completely free everywhere, it can really damage that progress in making, and keeping, our parks beautiful and great for all of us to enjoy.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4119

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

208524

Representative Quote: In addition, the impact to the surrounding land area is being affected because the off leash dogs DO run off the fire roads and trails across sensitive habitat areas, again, because often these dog walkers are not controlling them or keeping them nearby.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4408

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

206414

Representative Quote: I remember when Fort Funston was covered in ice plant around the parking lot area. Ice plant is a very tough "bullet proof" plant. I have spent time pulling up this native in areas where the native habitat is being restored. This plant has literally been worn away by the presence of so

many dogs. Dogs dig and dog urine burns grass and other plants, probably due to the high nitrogen content. Grass in SF parks is crisscrossed by numerous dogs, and dead grass can easily be seen in circular areas where repeated marking from the dogs has occurred. These areas continue to enlarge as more dogs urinate there. I think this is another reason to limit the dogs to fenced areas.

Concern ID:

29621

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:
Representative
Quote(s):**

There are many areas with fragile newly planted native vegetation. When dogs run unleashed through these areas, they impact the ability of this planted vegetation to grow.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1206

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

194842

Representative Quote: And I also have spoken to many volunteers in the replanting areas of Crissy as well as the Presidio. The off leash dogs wreak havoc on many native plantings and wildlife areas, and can frighten people out hiking who aren't expecting a loose dog at their heels when rounding a corner.

Please consider that many of us feel over-powered by the off-leash voices, but that many of us with dogs, who walk them ourselves every day, welcome some reigning in of conditions and hope for enforcement of any changes.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1246

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

194930

Representative Quote: Most owners are careful to clean up pet feces when they can, but not all is removed, and there's no cleaning up urine. In addition, some overestimate their voice control. Too often I've seen dogs rush around a newly-planted area digging holes, chasing mice, and relieving themselves, while the owner shouts the dog's name to no avail.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2058

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200513

Representative Quote: As a volunteer, I help plant native plants in the park. Numerous times I have seen dogs disobey their owners while off-leash. For example: One day- a woman walking her dog off leash near our work site lost control of her dog. The dog ran into the sensitive planting area and began growling and barking at the volunteers. The woman was unable to capture her dog when she called for it. The dog ran away from her and then both she and the dog were trampling through the planting area. This wastes the National Park's money and time. And several of the volunteers were upset by the dog's erratic behavior.

Corr. ID: Organization: University of Louisville

2194

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200689

Representative Quote: I later witnessed other dogs rooting around, and defecating in one of the precious few areas that have undergone some native plant restoration work. Despite the presence of obvious signage illustrating the work that had taken place there, and several informative brochures noting just how rare of a micro-climate that portion of the S.F. peninsula provides, it almost seemed like the dogs were there specifically to undermine every attempt to give the part back to it's natural state

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2211

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

200731

Representative Quote: The purchase of the Mori Point property by the GGNRA a few years ago and the consequent work done by the park employees and volunteers is an amazing improvement and a work of art. Unfortunately there are still many who walk their dogs off leash and allow them to root around the newly planted areas. Off leash pets should not be allowed on any GGNRA property where the tax payers money and the park service efforts are compromised by thoughtless dog owners

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

3324

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

202930

Representative Quote: I am writing in the hopes that my comments will help sway the decision towards the alternate plan D or A. I care for dogs, but am all too aware of how destructive they can be to sensitive habitats. My job is to restore habitats in the bay area. Within the areas I work, there are many dog walkers who allow their pets to run around off-leash and off trail. Because of this, many of our native plants we planted are trampled and killed. It is so disheartening to work for over a year growing these precious little native plants, only to have them die because of careless dog owners. I

think that dogs on leash in parks without endangered species should be allowed. Those park sites with listed species, should either allow no dogs or only dogs on leash. The difficulty with this however, is that most of the GGNRA is not actively policed by park rangers. Without regular enforcement, people will continue to allow their dogs off-leash. Professional dog walkers should also be heavily regulated, because it is often these groups that do the most damage. I hope that the park will pass a strict plan like A or D so that its natural resources will be protected and the parks can thrive.

Concern ID:

29622

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Impacts to vegetation and riparian areas are vastly overstated in the plan. The vegetation present at many sites in the GGNRA is non-native. Dogs are well-behaved and under the control of their owners, who respect fenced off areas and native plantings.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

263

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

180849

Representative Quote: Why do we need to make changes? The dogs are well behaved and the owners are respectful of the native species and plants. We need this to stay dog friendly.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

1515

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

190671

Representative Quote: I have never witnessed any harmful encounters between dogs and wildlife, or plant life and instead of restricting space for dogs should issue fines for incidents allowing visitor/people to report. Having such fines would motivate people/dogowners to respect the habitat.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

2936

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

202231

Representative Quote: The parks provide many valuable uses for our community, including uses for the human community. I pick up after my dog, keep her out of fenced areas, and make sure she presents no harm to any wildlife (such as birds). There are many of us seniors who count on the dog parks for our personal recreation. It is safe, healthy, and beautiful. Please do not make Fort Funston inaccessible to me, to others like me, and to responsible dog owners and walkers in our community.

Seniors like myself are often living on restricted incomes, and it is important for our mental and physical health to have an opportunity to safely socialize with a like-minded community. Fort Funston has resources, such as plants and geologic resources, but it is equally important not to ignore the social resources; the human social resource should be of equal value as the geologic resources.

This, however, begs the point that we users of the park are in conflict with the environment peculiarities of the environment (bird safety, care of the dunes, growth opportunities for specialized plants). To argue that we are in conflict is a false assumption, and to conclude that off-leash dog use (and the people to whom the dogs are attached) are a danger to the flora and fauna of the park is a conclusion that is ineluctably drawn from a false premise. We all guard the plant life, we clean up after our animals, we value the wild animal life (i.e. the birds); in the 5 years that I have

walked, limped, or rolled on the path at Fort Funston, I have never observed a dog harming a bird. Someone posted a picture of a dog chasing an injured bird by the beach. That is a peculiar and one-time activity - an activity that neither I nor anyone I have ever asked has seen repeated. Please do not draw a false and harmful conclusion from a one-time, media seeking photo op provided by those who look for ways to cause the GGRNA to change its policy.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4145

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

208620

Representative Quote: As an avid environmentalist, I am very supportive of the work the GGNRA has done to curtail erosion and protect plant and wildlife in the parks. I make sure that neither I nor my dog goes into areas that have been fenced off and designated (with signage) for replanting or environmental protection. In my experience, all dog-owners I've come across in GGNRA areas have very effectively used voice control to keep their dogs off these areas.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4155

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

208666

Representative Quote: The original 1979 ruling in regards to off leash dog walking areas should be honored. The bad science in the DEIS doesn't prove that dogs off leash are bad. The plants are better than they have ever been, the wildlife is more abundant that it has ever been and there are more people enjoying the GGNRA. I walk my dog off leash at Crissy Field, Baker Beach and Ocean Beach. He is always under voice control and loves to chase his frisbee both in and out of the water. Both these activities would be impossible if he were on leash.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4319

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209428

Representative Quote: In the twenty-nine years that I've been walking at Fort Funston, I've never seen a serious dogfight among the off-leash dogs, nor have I ever seen a person attacked or harassed by a dog. I haven't seen vegetation destroyed by dogs, with the exception of areas of summer foxtails that get trampled. On the other hand, I have seen dramatic effects by wind and water over the years on the plants, cliffs, and hilly areas

Concern ID:

29623

CONCERN STATEMENT:

People and other natural factors have a much greater impact on vegetation and riparian areas than dogs. Families, events, non-native species, and the elements all impact vegetation in the parks, not just dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

25

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209627

Representative Quote: 2) The biggest problems to habitat are restricting usage of the park to trail or public use areas and dog feces. Park trail access is also a problem for humans. I recently saw a family in Muir Beach that didn't want to use the pedestrian bridge, saw a shortcut through the lagoon and trampled through the newly planted area that park staff and volunteers have so carefully planted. They didn't have a dog. Should

we also ban humans from Muir Beach as well? If you value the habitat, that may be prudent. I see far more humans abusing habitat at the Muir Beach lagoon than people, including off-trail usage and littering. On the matter of dog fecal matter, why not require all people that are walking dogs to provide evidence of having poopie bags for removing litter? Anyone without a bag is obviously going to let their dog's fecal matter by the side of the trail and should be fined.

Corr. ID: Organization: individual - cannot uncheck "member"

1043

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

191840

Representative Quote: For example, when visiting Muir Beach, I see children run amok in sensitive areas as dogs play in the surf or lounge with their families. Where is the signage to protect recently restored riparian areas and the mouth of the salmon stream? It is not being threatened by responsible dog owners, but by irresponsible or uneducated people.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

3444

Comment Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

203250

Representative Quote: Dogs do not negatively impact the environment. It is not the dogs that are stealing the nesting eggs from the birds, it is the crows and ravens! That is why there are fewer birds.

Mother Nature changes the landscape at Fort Funston on a daily basis. The wind, rain and wave water erosion cause the land to change dramatically. Everyday! So, it does not matter that the dogs run up and down the hills because they are always changing and will continue to do so, wether or not the dogs are there!

The dogs do not impact the ice plant - which is the natural plant that grows out there. What the heck? Ice Plant????

Dog walkers benefit working people in allowing them to have time to go to work and spend with their families rather than doing this chore.

Dogs benefit from daily runs on the beach because they are better behaved and less aggressive when at home.

Dog walkers, by their sheer presence, keep gangs and violence off the beach and out of parks.

Our urban parks will be saturated with dogs and there will be a negative impact financially and more serious dog fights (and people fights)

There is a community of people that go to Fort Funston that will disappear and this is a tragedy.

Are the horses allowed to stay on the trails and we are excluded?

How the heck are we suppose to keep 6 large, excited dogs on leash going down the trails? I had my finger broken by a dog pulling me down the beach. How safe do you think it is for someone to be expected to dragged by 6 dogs wanting to run free? Also, I need my hands free for safety. The trails are unstable and sometimes I need to use my hands to stabilize myself or grab branches or rocks.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4172

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

208740

Representative Quote: I have a degree in ecology and my first job was as an intern for the GGNRA at Fort Funston. I wanted to give you this information so you understand my commitment and knowledge of the ecosystem and plant community at Fort Funston. The current plan seems to blame dogs for all the damage and harm that comes to the native ecosystem life living there. This is false as anyone who works there or has worked there should be aware of. The real damage that you can see is the non-native invasive species such as ice plant, grasses, and other weeds which out compete the native species such as bi-color lupine, indian paint brush, and others that give our home part of its unique beauty. When I worked at Fort Funston in 1998, the GGNRA was able to restore two parts of the park. Both of these are thriving with native species and have not suffered damage from recreational use by the public or their pets. These remain to date the only parcels of land which have been restored and with budget cuts ending the visitor center and native plant nursery, I don't see much hope for future restoration projects.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4533

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209690

Representative Quote: I personally have observed and reported people climbing into fenced of vegetation areas at Crissy Field to take photos and to get better views during events, as well as children playing in the areas, running up and down the dunes. I have also observed people hiking off of the trails in the areas above Rodeo Beach and people on bicycles where they are not allowed. In addition, I have observed and reported large amounts of garbage and litter left behind after events, or not immediately picked up at the conclusion of the events, so that birds and other wildlife have foraged in the garbage, possibly ingesting harmful items. The dunes and fencing along the beach at Crissy Field are regularly impacted by the wind and tides. It is common for the park police horses to leave deposits along the trails in the park. I am really curious as to how the proposals for the America's Cup event (which I support) will impact the area and how that environmental analysis compares to the DEIS. All of these other impacts (and not just the ones I have listed as examples) must be evaluated as well before negative impacts are merely attributed to the presence of dogs.

Corr. ID: Organization: *Not Specified*

4548

CommentOrganization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

ID:

209813

Representative Quote: The majority of problems are people related. There is the occasional dog fight but those are usually a lot of noise.

Yes dogs do run in the fenced areas but in all fairness the fences are almost non-existing. And in reality the area is sand dunes. The majority of the damage to the plants is done by sand.

VR4000 - Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Concern ID:

29625

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Concentrating dogs into smaller spaces will result in greater impacts to vegetation within these restricted spaces. These areas will receive more wear and tear as a result.

For additional representative quotes, please see [Concern 29507 \(GR4000\)](#), [Comment 192048](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4569 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209831 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The Preferred Plan for dogs at Fort Funston is nothing more than a dog park. If that limited area north of the parking lot is used by the same number of people and dogs that currently use the entire Fort Funston area then all the vegetation will be destroyed leaving sand blowing worse than it, does now. Also, that many dogs and people in a limited area will cause more conflict.

Concern ID: 29626
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Measures restricting dogs are necessary to protect the native vegetation found in the GGNRA. These areas should not be subject to the impacts of dogs and humans for their protection](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1052 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 192139 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Remind the Park Service that while dogs are important parts of our families and communities, they are just one animal that is having a significant negative impact on thousands of other animals that rely on the park to survive. It is fair to ask dog owners to accept certain limits for areas where their dogs may play when the survival and well being of so many wildlife animals and plants is at stake.

Corr. ID: 1684 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191082 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 1) There are many, many wilderness areas within GGNRA that are close to being pristine - with abundant wildlife and plant life that should be protected, with minimal impact by humans or domesticated animals, because unfortunately these all do impact these areas negatively - these areas are so vast, it would be impossible for rangers & park police to patrol adequately.

Corr. ID: 2221 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 200825 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: This document proposes a way to protect native vegetation in national parks located in the SF area. For that reason, it should be supported.
Corr. ID: 3420 **Organization:** NPCA
Comment ID: 201427 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog parks in California are popular and needed as healthy outlets for dog energy. However, in my view, they need to be carefully selected. At times, image or territory on the map does not give information about the true needs of the environment in those places. At Golden Gate area, so close to major city and harbor, having a park of National Park stature is a fragile treasure. It does not seem to be appropriate towards utilization by even beloved household pets. In every dog park I have ever seen, greenery gets nearly destroyed and birds and animals devastated.... adorned by leftovers of pets' excrement. I am not familiar enough with the Golden Gate area, but I suggest seriously that it should be protected for all nature's living there without fear and struggle, thus remain recreational for the body, mind and spirit as only the undisturbed parks render.

Concern ID: 29627
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Marshes, dunes, and other fragile vegetated habitats are often full of dogs. It is important to both remove dogs from this area to protect vegetation and wildlife habitat. In many cases, commenters noted that the preferred alternative would still](#)

have impacts on flora, and suggested that alternative D be chosen instead.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29475 (CF1400), Comment 203616; Concern 29238 (OV1300), Comment 209388; Concern 29238 (RB1300), Comment 209389; Concern 29458 (CF1200), Comment 209391; Concern 29424 (FF1200), Comment 209393

Concern ID: 29628

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Some areas do not contain endangered plants, so there is no need to ban off leash dog walking. The removal of ice plant and other habitat restoration projects have negative impacts by causing more sand to blow around in areas where this occurs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4577

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209677

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2. Absence of Critical Habitat Protection. At the open house held at Fort Mason, one of the senior rangers confirmed that there were few, if any endangered flora at Fort Funston because of decades of urban and natural degradation beginning with the area's use as a military complex. I have also not seen anything in the NPS Report that suggests otherwise, other than declaratory general statements that there would be some adverse impacts. Yet, the NPS's preferred solution would close the entire area to off-leash dog walking.

As for fauna, where bank swallows or other birds nest on a seasonal basis, the NPS has a reasonable solution that adequately balances competing interests by simply closing those affected areas on a temporary basis to off-leash dogs or, if necessary, to any dog-walking activity.

Corr. ID: 4659

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209070

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As to Fort Funston, I believe the 2001 closures there have not lent significant benefit to the environment or safety. The Park Service has not achieved the planned native plant restoration goals and is not anticipated to do so for decades. On the other side, the closures have led to a substantial loss of key recreation access to a unique recreational asset ' the only big sand dune in the Bay Area. I used to watch kids play there, and confess to the joy of rolling down the hill myself in foolish middle age exuberance. It is now just a fenced off vacant sand dune area standing as a daily frustration and visible monument to Park Service deviation from the recreational access mandate of the park.

VR5000 - Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Cumulative Impacts

There were no comments on VR5000

VR6000 - Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Impairment Analyses

There were no comments on VR6000

VU2010 - Visitor Use and Experience: Affected Environment

Concern ID:

30419

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Visitors have never had incidents with dog waste on the beach, or with the smell of urine being strong enough to impact their visitor experience. Additionally, visitors did not feel that the sound of barking took away from the experience of the GGNRA, particularly more so than other non-natural noises.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 286

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181012

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And dog ownership in Marin County is a big thing -- you are limiting access to people who want to enjoy the outdoors with their companions (their dogs) for what reason? How many more restrictions are you going to put on people? The dogs aren't hurting the beach. Maybe signs need to be bigger about cleaning up after their dogs, but honestly, I've never had an incident where I've found any dog poo on the beach.

Corr. ID: 4369

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209512

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My experience is that dog owners are cleaning up after their dogs and respecting posted restricted areas. I looked for site-specific data on damage to protected wildlife and the environment that would support your proposal to severely restrict off-leash dog areas. I could find no data of the extent of the damage or specific causal ties to off-leash dogs at Crissy Field. I also could not find any trend numbers correlating off-leash dog use to deterioration of the environment. I found no scientific study to support your highly-restricted conclusions.

Corr. ID: 4600

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206053

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I want to point to one factor that the report identified as an important 'natural' resource to protect ' soundscapes. The report found the topic to be important enough that it warranted its own subsection on Visitor Use section of the document (page 281). Barking is specifically called out as something that disrupts the soundscape, yet the areas addressed in the DEIS with dog usage all fit the following criteria:

- They are frequented by visitors
- They currently are subject to some sort of use with dogs

In any of the areas that fit that criteria, a change to the dog regulations fails spectacularly to address the primary degradation in the natural soundscapes.

Fort Funston faces a reduced off leash area to a ROLA next to the parking lot and the beach. However, the areas eliminated along the paved trails get the constant noise of both the traffic on Skyline Boulevard and the constant return of gunfire from two gun ranges immediately outside of the GGNRA.

Crissy Field in San Francisco abuts a heavily trafficked park road. It also gets the constant traffic noise from Doyle Drive (or the construction thereof), and it gets the shipping noises and fog horns from the bay. The changes hardly serve any improvement with these areas.

Ocean Beach runs along the great highway with its constant vehicle traffic which is only abated by special events such as the Bay to Breakers. This event is hardly known for its natural soundscapes.

Fort Baker is now home not only to traffic on the roads, but also Cavallo Point resort. This activity is hardly one that creates a 'natural' soundscape.

Corr. ID: 4622

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207053 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Soundscape -

The DEIS does not include relevant information related to the soundscape at Fort Funston and cites dog barking as an issue. As an almost daily user of Fort Funston, it is my experience is that there is very little dog barking, and what dog barking does occur primarily occurs inside vehicles in the parking lot. Changing the current off leash to the "preferred alternative" will not decrease dog barking. In fact, the change to the "preferred alternative" will result in the increase of dog barking in other parts of Fort Funston as the "preferred alternative" off leash areas are too small to accommodate the amount of users (for which NPS has not conducted any accurate statistical site survey of users), and dogs restrained on leashes in other parts of the Fort are much more apt to bark than when they are off leash.

No reference is made in the DEIS to the constant noise from the very heavy use of Hwy 1-Skyline Blvd by cars, trucks and buses. This can be heard in all parts of Fort Funston with the exception of the beach. No reference is made in the DEIS to the gunshot noise of the Pacific Rod & Gun Club range adjacent to Fort Funston which can be heard through all areas of the Fort, excluding the beach area. No reference is made to the noise from the SF Police Gun Range adjacent to the Fort Funston, that seemingly is operated 24/7 and can be heard through all parts of the Fort, excluding the beach. No reference is made in the DEIS to the noise made by the hang gliders. No reference is made in the DEIS to the noise made by model airplanes. No reference is made in the DEIS to the noise generated by the significant number of SFO passenger jet takeoffs over Fort Funston and / or parallel to the beach and in climb out prior to turning eastbound (depending on SFO flight rules then being utilized.)

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s):

30420

The waste present on the beaches and trails from dogs is unclean. The smell and unsanitary conditions make it less desirable to go to areas with heavy dog walking use, and some visitors had stepped in dog waste.

Corr. ID: 1159

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 193458

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Many dog owners allow their dogs to poop in the sand on Ocean Beach, making it difficult for others to enjoy. Dogs poop all over the trails making enjoyment of a routine walk on the any of the trails less likely

Corr. ID: 2340

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 195388

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My daughter is 5 years old and I began taking her to Crissy Field at the age of 1. I stopped at the age of 2. The first problem with Crissy Field is that the overwhelming smell of dog urine is nauseating and disgusting. Why would we want our children digging in this sand? The next issue is that the dogs were constantly running through my picnic blanket and sniffing my daughter. With the issues we've had in this town, we all know how scary and dangerous it can be when a big dog gets exciting around a small child.

Corr. ID: 4519

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 209582

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My grandchildren have not had access to the beach at the tidal entrance to Crissy Marsh due to excessive dog use in that area.

My grand-daughter, then age 7, stepped into dog feces hidden in the grass of Crissy Field. I would like to see the future dog area on Crissy Field fenced.

Corr. ID: 4530

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 209720 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Although I love dogs (I am a dog person), I do not enjoy walking on trails where there is dog poop or dogs running wild.

Once unleashed, a dog goes where he/she will. I live along the estuary in Alameda and have problems with unleashed dogs and their waste in my yard.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

30421

The sounds of dogs barking negatively impacted the visitor experience of many visitors, particularly those who were seeking natural sounds, and did not want to hear dogs or any noises associated with dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1166 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193536 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: . I love land end but it is now ruined due to dogs. Not only is nature being destroyed but I can no longer go there due to off leash dogs and rude dog owners. I don't even go to on leash areas of the ggnra because the sounds of dogs barking ruins nature for me. I don't think dogs should be allowed in national parks or in nature in general. Definitely no off leash dogs and no on leash dogs would be ideal.

Corr. ID: 2161 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200577 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly oppose any dogs in the GGNRA. In this, I am supported by many others; seniors like myself, disabled people, blind people, many of whom have refrained from using the GGNRA where irresponsible dog owners refuse (and most often are not able)to control their dogs. Dogs are a huge liability. You cannot share spaces with them; they run all over everything -- including you -- they bark, whine, yap, thus destroying the beautiful sounds of nature with their angry, hostile noise. They urinate and defecate everywhere. Some of them are vicious, and attack people and other animals at will. Even the leashed ones befoul any area they are in.

Corr. ID: 2175 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200568 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: When I visit any of our National Parks, I want to be in the park, with nature, enjoying what is there. I prefer not to hear anything other than the sounds of nature and those of my fellow park visitors. That includes the barking and play-noises of dogs greeting other dogs.

I would also prefer that the natural environment of the park not be torn up by the rough-housing of dogs.

Corr. ID: 2892 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202973 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Although much wildlife in busy parks has had to become somewhat habituated to human encroachment (we ourselves are not a good presence for wildlife), even a well-behaved dog presents an olfactory threat that may cause an endemic species to permanently abandon its food or shelter source , but often the harm is much greater than that:

Dog waste contains microbes that are not part of the biota of our naturally-evolved native ecosystems, and this waste enters terrestrial and aquatic life cycles. Dogs can flush out and chase fauna, harm native vegetation, and assist in spreading serious diseases (such as SOD), because most dogs do not maintain all feet on the provided trail at all times.

Dogs can cause noise pollution, run or jump at strangers, and impede forward progress of hikers, runners, bicyclists, and equestrians. These dog behaviors can severely scare nearby wildlife and many types of visitors. Dogs can sometimes "take" wildlife to the point of death.

As a visitor I have seen most of the above incidents occur first hand, and all of them happened with a dog still on a leash!

Corr. ID: 3984

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207313

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In support of well-defined and realistically enforced dog management.

Unfortunately my precious outdoor time has been increasingly degraded by untrained, unrestrained, unavoidable canine influences. By this i mean dog noise, dog excrement, random dogs jumping on me, dogs charging & nipping at me, owner & dog on leash taking up the whole 2-way path with no intention, awareness, or effort to "keep to the right". These intrusions occur in dogs-allowed parks, no dogs-allowed parks, and stretches of shoreline that are bird sanctuaries.

Concern ID:

30422

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Visitors, including those with guide dogs, expressed that they had been frightened by dogs running up to them, or had incidents with dogs biting, jumping on them, or urinating on them. Some commenters noted that they had stopped visiting areas in the GGNRA after several similar experiences, or started carrying sticks and other items for self-defense.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 506

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181898

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a Guide Dog user as is my daughter and several of our friends. When we go to any beach, either regulated by GOGA or San Francisco Maritime NHP, we have had some problems with dogs off leash. Our dogs are never left to run off leash, one because they are working dogs, and two, because it is unsafe not only for them but for us as well. It is very disconcerting when you have a dog, who is not on leash, running up to your dog, sometimes causing trouble, or just wanting to play, and distracting our dogs when they are trying to work.

Corr. ID: 961

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191595

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We tried to walk there once when our children were toddlers and were approached by bounding dogs at every turn. The owners would sometimes call out "don't worry; he's friendly" but we were still sufficiently intimidated not to return. My parents, who are not steady on their feet, have given up walking there for the same reason.

I would like to raise an important point, which is that many of Fort Funston's visitors who are not dog walkers have by now completely given up using the park. I almost never go there myself and my parents don't either, though it was, at one time, our favorite park in San Francisco.

Corr. ID: 1829

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191950

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a long time resident of Marin, who has enjoyed the beaches at Stinson and the trails on Mt. Tam for many years, I believe the dog population of this area has become an aggravation if not a hazard to residents. At Rodeo Beach I have had an off leash dog urinate on my head as I lay face down on a beach towel. "So sorry" was the apology of the owners. "Voice control" of pets is an illusion as a 100 pound animal bounds over to pedestrians and sometimes to

children-"he's just friendly" says the owner

Corr. ID: 3548 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203410 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It has been hard to relax at Muir Beach with so many dogs running loose, including dogs of breeds that are statistically more likely to seriously injure people. I want to be able to go to this beach and relax and not worry about being bothered by dogs nor worry about my children's safety. It's sad, but this is the one and only reason I haven't gone to this beach in a long time, and I should be able to go and feel safe since this is our nearest beach.

Please consider that hikers, runners, beach-goers should be allowed a good number of beautiful trails and beaches where they can enjoy nature and not have to deal with dogs. The dogs have plenty of places to enjoy, it seems that with the way the rules are now, they are held in higher regard than those of us who want dog-free options.

Corr. ID: 4277 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209083 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I now walk with my Leki walking sticks, which I usually reserve for wilderness walks. but which I now feel I must walk with in order to use them in self-defense. Pedestrians in San Francisco and in the GGRNA should. NOT feel that they can only walk if armed.

Corr. ID: 4291 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209026 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We love going to Cronkite Beach but too many dogs jumping on my wife - completely out of control. Dog people say their dogs just want to play - we hate it. I used to fish there until every time dogs pissed on my lunch box and fishing gear. By the time I find a ranger the dog and owner are gone. Dogs chase the birds, also. If mothers of small children know of all the dog feces in the sand they would put a stop to it.

Corr. ID: 4665 **Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association

Comment ID: 209149 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Other user groups, such as those with service dogs, have stated their concerns with off-leash dog use. One survey from Guide Dog Users, Inc. concluded that 89% of guide dog users report off-leash dogs interference with the guide-owner team and 42% report physical attacks on the guide-and-owner team.

Concern ID:

30423

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Visitors noted that they had never had an incident with dog owners or other users of the park. All the user groups were able to utilize the space harmoniously.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1162 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193476 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are not that many locations where I can bring my dog to enjoy the outdoors without multitude of restrictions or not at all. Over the course of my time of using the trails, I have come across only respectful and courteous dog owners and people alike all enjoying nature harmoniously.

Corr. ID: 3202 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202489 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm a new dog owner, but for years I enjoyed all those area that are discussed here while hiking and bicycling without a dog. I have never been bothered by dogs, or witnessed any damages done by them. Most dogs owners are responsible. Why would we apply the collective punishment by restricting the dog areas use because of the irresponsible behavior of a very few dog owners? I VERY

STRONGLY SUPPORT Option A: CHANGE NOTHING!!!

Corr. ID: 3490

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203349

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am against the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. It destroys totally my daily live. I walk every day with my dog of leash for about 4 miles. My doctors advised me to do so. I am a heart patient.

This draft is discrimination against all dog lovers.

The old rules are good and worked for many years, please keep them in place.

Corr. ID: 3498

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203386

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to make a brief comment as a dog owner and citizen. I have walked my dogs off leash at Fort Funston for almost 20 years.

During that time, I have been impressed by the collegiality and care for the environment shown by the user groups. I have also seen impressive restoration of native vegetation, which has not been in any way disturbed or impeded by the presence of dogs off leash. Almost all of the dog owners I have encountered over the years have been respectful of the off limits areas, have cleaned up after their dogs, and have cooperated with Park Service personnel. In an era of budget cuts to our National Parks, the presence of many responsible dog owners is a real benefit as this kind of usage helps keep Fort Funston safe and accessible for all. Based on all of the above and on the lack of very few alternatives for safe and healthy off leash dog walking in the urban environment of San Francisco, I VERY STRONGLY oppose the proposed restrictions in the proposed Dog Management Plan. As a responsible dog owner and citizen, I believe that these new rules are unwarranted, unfair, and will have a negative long term impact on Fort Funston and the GGNRA if they are implemented. I have contacted my elected representatives about this and will remain actively engaged to do everything in my power to insure that this wonderful resource for people and dogs - many of whom are from shelters - remains available to our community.

Corr. ID: 4027

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207105

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have walked my dog daily at Crissy Field (from west end of lagoon to fort point) for 10 years. While there are cranky people and mad dogs, that is few and far between. Never have I seen a "pack of threatening dogs". On average, like a busy Memorial Day today, there were about 250 people, 8 dogs on the grassy area, and 10 on the beach,(west beach area) 2 dogs off leash and 10 dogs on leash on the gravel trail. Off season and foggy days (almost 360 days) there are generally 2 dogs in the grassy area, 4 on the beach, and maybe 3 off leash.

Corr. ID: 4187

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208776

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a windsurfer I have for years made considerable use of the beach at Crissy field in harmony with dog users. Having spent much more time as a user without a dog I believe I can impartially state that the dog use at any of the Crissy field areas has not posed a problem for me or anyone I know or have seen in the parks.

Corr. ID: 4201

Organization: self, City College of San Francisco employee

Comment ID: 208839

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you've ever personally spent time walking in the Ft. Funston area or Ocean Beach or any number of open spaces, you would see, as I have seen, a lovely and serendipitous mix of dogs running free and parents with children (or single parents on their cell phones as their toddlers run into the ocean), people flying kites, surfers, picnickers, joggers, yogis, lovers, the elderly out for a stroll, and friends playing ball. Perhaps you have not noticed the lonely, the

grieving, the disabled, the mentally ill-all of them finding solace in nature and, many of them, in the curative powers of a pleasant exchange with dog-owners, dog-walkers, and dogs-open and free, easy and non-threatening.

Corr. ID: 4562

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209750

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As homeowners and dog lovers, we spend many of our weekends at Chrissy Field, at Fort Funston, in Golden Gate Park. My daughter, husband, and I find enormous peace, fun and happiness walking and playing in these parks, playing ball and watching our dogs have a chance to run by our sides off leash. Under voice control - of course - but free to walk and run unencumbered by a leash. It fuels our mental and physical health ' and frankly keeps us living in the City. In sixteen years, I have never experienced dogs behaving badly, scaring children or birds, or fighting with each other.

Concern ID:

30424

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Visitors said they had never seen an altercation between humans and dogs in their experience at the park. Visitors have not experienced issues with dogs entering restricted areas, or harming vegetation or wildlife. In fact, many visitors felt dog owners improved the parks

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 560

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182034

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Fort Funston has been a treasure for taking our dog where she can run with other dogs in a natural environment.

The vast majority of people who walk the trails and on the beach are dog owners. I have never seen owners allowing their dogs to go into restricted areas where there is vegetation growing. While I am sure there are some violators, even with new rules there will be violations.

I understand that there must be rules in this park, but is there a problem currently that requires that you be more restrictive than at present.

Corr. ID: 3551

Organization: Audubon, Sierra Club, WildCare, Defenders of Wildlife, Nature Conservancy, In Defense of Animals

Comment ID: 203434

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We feel very strongly that there is enough land for all users, providing they are responsible, which is a problem for everyone, not just dog owners. Speeding bikers, bikers on prohibited trails, people leaving trash etc. are just a few of the other problems. We strongly support no dogs in critical breeding grounds, leashed dogs in some areas and no dogs in other areas. However, as with the debate with MCOSD, we also believe that dog owners should be allowed to use a part of these lands with their off-leash dogs.

One of the places we have been taking our dogs for years is Oakwood Valley. We have never witnessed one dog-related incident detrimental to wildlife or humans in the 20+ years we have been walking there with our unleashed dogs. We understand dogs are only allowed on 0.5% of all GGNRA land. On MCOSD dogs are only allowed on about 6% of the land. We have witnessed the following...birders and plants seekers going off trail in large groups to look into nests, pish for birds, pick flowers etc. Is that not also disturbing to animals?

Walking your dogs off-leash is so nice for both the owner and the dogs. We look at wildflowers and birds and they smell doggie things and run through mud puddles. When we see someone coming we call them to our side until we know it is a good situation for all. We don't see much wildlife on the fireroads and trails heavily used by bikers, walkers, birders, and dog owners. They stay in the more remote parts of

the land where there is less human impact. Also, many people cannot walk their dogs on leash due to a disability so this would end all walks for them.

Corr. ID: 4109 **Organization:** Friends of Upper Noe Dog Owners Group

Comment ID: 208485 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Even so, in all the many years that we have gone to any of the local beaches as a family, we have never witnessed any altercations between dogs or between humans and dogs, or an attack on birds. And, while the Ocean Beach area directly north of Sloat has seasonal restrictions there is no evidence in the DEIS to support the closures of beach access because of the presence of snowy plovers.

Corr. ID: 4163 **Organization:** former member of the San Francisco Commission on Animal Control and Welfare

Comment ID: 208727 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've never been a guardian to a dog but in the four years I took my granddaughter to the park when she was a baby, then a toddler, I never saw any conflict between the above three concerns. On the contrary, one morning I saw a young mother with a toddler and a big dog, off leash in Mountain Lake Park (a medium-sized park in the Richmond District of San Francisco with a little lake, lots of birds, children and off-leash big dogs who do not restrict themselves to just the off-leash dog run) showing her little daughter how to pick up their dog's feces and dispose of it responsibly, then after thoroughly brushing the dog for a while, she gathered his combed out fur and placed the soft furry ball behind some bushes surrounded by trees. Noticing we were watching her, she explained with a smile: "The birds like the fur for their nests."

Corr. ID: 4223 **Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group

Comment ID: 208945 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Personally, I visit Crissy Field several times a week, on average, and I have not seen a dog altercation in several years. I have never seen a dog be aggressive to an adult or a child. With the many dogs that are there on weekdays, and the hundreds that are there on weekends, I think that is quite remarkable, and certainly does not justify the restrictions being put forth in the GGNRA's preferred alternative.

Corr. ID: 4323 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209459 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In over 7 years of visiting Fort Funston I cannot recall a single incident of conflict or of someone being disrespectful of the natural environment. Due to this I am skeptical of the draft EIS's claim that the presence of dogs is having a significant negative impact on wildlife. All such claims need to be substantiated with well documented, site specific, scientific evidence that also analyzes the impact of other recreational uses of the space (i.e. equestrians, boaters, fishermen, hikers, bikers, runners, hang gliders, etc).

Corr. ID: 4520 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209589 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Over the many years I have enjoyed and explored the GGNRA I have never witnessed a serious encounter between people with their dogs and the native wildlife. Dogs may chase birds for a while, but I have never seen a dog catch a bird. Nor have I seen an owner encourage the behavior. Generally I have witnessed dog owners intervene, restrain and discourage their dogs from endangering wildlife.

Concern ID:
CONCERN STATEMENT:

30425
Experiences with unfriendly or belligerent dog owners were cited by some visitors as a reason that they no longer enjoyed visiting the GGNRA. Commenters noted

that dog owners were rude when asked to leash their dogs, pick up waste, or leave restricted areas, and that when incidents occurred, dog owners often blamed the other visitor.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1160

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193465

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: live in SF and try to enjoy GGNRA weekly, but it has become more difficult with the proliferation of off-leash dogs at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Lands End. I have been attacked by dogs on numerous occasions. Last month I was yelled at by a dog owner after her dog attacked me. She told me that I must have food in my pockets. This is ridiculous. It has become so contentious on these walks that people definitely have a harder time enjoying these areas than they used to.

Corr. ID: 2187

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200581

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On many hikes and visits to GGNRA parks, I and my two young children, have been approached by unleashed dogs. Both of my children are now terrified of dogs and the owners have little remorse or concern for the safety or well being of my children.

I often ask owners to leash their dogs when my children are around. I receive rude comments and many times people ignore my requests and do not leash their dogs. As a parent and visitor to the GGNRA I need authority and enforcement to ensure that people keep their dogs on leashes to keep the rest of us safe and free to enjoy the parks.

Corr. ID: 3815

Organization: Wild Equity Institute

Comment ID: 226964

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Many non-compliant dog owners are abusive to visitors who complain to them about their dog's behavior or their handling of their dog.

Corr. ID: 3852

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209324

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 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.

Corr. ID: 4024

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206982

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I cannot fully enjoy walking at Crissy Field or Land's End because I have had many unpleasant interactions with dogs and their inconsiderate owners. I have been hit hard in the back by catapulted balls, been shocked when a large dog jumped from behind onto my hips and legs, felt scared when another dog jumped on my legs and closed its mouth around my fingers, and have repeatedly dodged whirlwinds of dogs chasing each other. I enjoy well-behaved dogs in appropriate places, and in the past owned a wonderful, trained dog, but do not invite interaction with strange dogs. Every time a dog aggressively approached me without my beckoning, I politely, yet firmly, confronted the owner, and each time I was met with incredible rudeness. I have never encountered a ranger around the time of the incident to report the interaction.

Corr. ID: 4267

Organization: Law Office of David Elliott Wise

Comment ID: 209104 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is, and always will be a sizable group of dog owners that have no control, or don't care, about what their dogs are doing; many act as if they feel that their dogs are members of their family, and that others need to adjust their expectations to allow for their dogs unruly behavior. Consequently, when me or my wife has asked owners to leash or control their dogs, we commonly get dismissive or even aggressive responses. This spoils the beach for us, for the wildlife, and the minority of dog owners who exercise real control over their dogs

Concern ID:

30426

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The presence of dogs, particularly out of control dogs, has made some visitors stop using areas at the GGNRA, as they felt their experience of the park was significantly compromised by the presence of so many dogs. Visitors felt stressed out by the presence of so many dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 337 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181106 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Often one hears that since areas like Fort Funston are mostly used by dog-walkers, it should remain that way. However, this was not true years ago. I believe that the presence of so many dogs in areas like that have driven away those who find the experience greatly degraded.

Corr. ID: 916 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191330 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And the situation as parks like Fort Funston has gotten quite out of hand. I won't even go there any longer because it is impossible to have any peace with all the dogs running around. The experience of the place has deteriorated so that unless you are dog owner, and the purpose of the place is to exercise the little beast, there is no use in going there.

Corr. ID: 1712 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191150 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA did not have as many dogs in the past. Over the past 10 years, I have noticed an explosion of dogs. I used to be ok with sharing the park with the odd dog walker, but now I find that I can't go to the park because there are so many dogs and so many dogs off leash. For this reason, I believe that off leash and on leash areas for dogs should be decreased.

Corr. ID: 4200 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208831 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The trail a couple of blocks from my house, Alta, has for years been used heavily by dog walkers who arrive with a large number of dogs and allow them to roam off-leash. I love dogs, however the sight of a large pack of off-leash dogs coming towards me frankly makes me nervous. Once, I was completely surrounded by barking dogs while carrying my baby. The dog walker, in the distance, called the dogs, but they were slow to obey.

My husband avoids the trail now, too, since an off-leash dog bit him.

Concern ID:

30427

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Dog owners who do not have their dogs under true voice control undermine the experience of other visitors to the park, who do not like listening to dog owners yelling to control their dogs. Many visitors relayed experiences of having dogs trample or steal food from their picnics or out of their hands, and urinating on their property, or just generally impacting their experience at the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1816 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191805 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am compassionate about protecting our lands and the native habits they support. This is why I am writing today in support of the most stringent controls on dog owners.

Of concern to me are animals under "voice control". I loved reading the idea in the plan to have dog/owner certified as being under voice control prior allowing them off leash. My experience with owners who say their dogs are under voice control is listening to them yell the same commands (usually, 'come here' and 'don't do that') time and time again without result. I like the serenity of a park stroll and this yelling does undermine my experience.

Corr. ID: 2556

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195652

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am in favor of your proposal.

I live directly across the street from an open space district which hosts dogs and walkers of all shapes and sizes. I put out a water dish and keep it filled, in an attempt to be friendly and neighborly to both dogs and walkers.

There is no such thing as voice control. Our weekends are punctuated by untrained dog walkers yelling for their dogs. Dogs routinely crash through the underbrush chasing deer and squirrels. We once had a dog chase our cat into our house through the front door.

At your beaches we have experienced, in addition to the above, untrained dog walkers watching their dog urinate on our family's toys spread on the sand. How do you explain that to a child?

You are wise to allocate a budget for enforcing your plan.

Please keep up the good work and implement your plan

Corr. ID: 2866

Organization: Women Helping All People

Comment ID: 202763

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On the Alta trail, it is a giant dog park. People do not have their dogs on leashes. Dog watchers bring their dogs there to run without leashes. Many are large dogs. When I go hiking there with children, most times the children are afraid of them. I think that they should be on leashes for safety for all! To be under voice control has been proven useless

Corr. ID: 3585

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203665

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are many users of the GGNRA including families with young children (such as my own family), seniors, and people with disabilities or a fear of dogs. Not everyone wants to recreate with off-leash dogs or even with on-leash dogs. I have had several negative experiences with dogs within the GGNRA, where I have had to pick up one of my children to get them away from a dog, push a dog away from our food, or clean dog poop off my children's shoes. My children are smaller than many dogs. While the majority of dog owners are responsible and the majority of dogs would not hurt my children, I am not always able to tell which dogs are safe and which are not. Worrying about what a dog may do or dealing with dogs that do approach us just takes away from our ability to enjoy and relax. I have tended to avoid parts of GGNRA that have high numbers of off-leash dogs, such as Fort Funston and portions of the beach at Crissy Field.

I have also seen many dogs off-leash at Ocean Beach within the on-leash Snowy Plover Protection area, which I find upsetting, as they are potentially impacting a

threatened species. I think as important as the establishment of clear rules on dogs is the enforcement of the rules by National Park Service officials. Under the current situation, it is not always clear what the rules are and whether or not they are enforced.

Corr. ID: 3705

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202241

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a frequent user of the parks, I have been concerned for some time about the increasing number of dogs allowed in the parks, particularly off-leash, and especially in beach and riparian areas. Although my primary concern is the disruption of wildlife habitat, I also feel that there are virtually no park areas left where a person can take a walk, observe nature, meditate, etc., without the presence of dogs.

Far too often I encounter ill-trained dogs off-leash, chasing shore birds, etc., and sometimes being actively encouraged by their owners to do so. I generally find that if I attempt to approach these people to voice my concerns, I am met with hostility.

On occasion dogs have jumped up on me, sometimes quite forcefully, and I have been left with muddied clothing and in one instance a knee injury. Sometimes the owners have been apologetic, but other times they just laugh at how playful their dogs are, as if no one could possibly experience discomfort at the prospect of being run into and jumped upon by a 50-pound animal. I was in a picnic area once designated as on-leash only, and a dog ran up and ate the hot dog right off of my plate. When I said something to its owner about the leash rule, he told me that I needed to educate myself about the park rules, as it was okay to have a dog off leash if it was under voice control. This struck me as so absurd, given the circumstances, that I did not bother to respond.

I could go on at length about other encounters with dog owners that left me feeling discouraged and disturbed, but the gist of my point is that I do not believe that rules for either on-leash or voice-control areas are enforceable, simply because most people do not obey the rules and there is no one to see that they do. I don't think that either dogs or dog owners are inherently bad. But I do think that we have become a "dog society" in which, no matter what the rules, dog owners do not really believe that they apply to them. Alternatively, I sometimes speak to people who had no idea that dogs were not allowed in a particular section, or only allowed on-leash. And I have to say that these designations are easy to blur. If an area is designated on-leash only, dogs will be off leash. If an area is voice-control, dogs will be running around without any supervision.

Corr. ID: 3961

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206063

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In my personal experience, no matter where I am in the park, I rarely get to have a dog-free experience. I like to go to the park to experience peace and solitude, away from noise, and to enjoy the beauty of the landscape. However it seems like wherever I go, I need to deal with someone's dog running up to me - whether cute or intimidating, they are interrupting my experience - and are usually accompanied by their owner's shouting at them in an attempt to demonstrate their responsibility and control - which is usually futile and further distracting.

Sometimes dogs are threatening or make me feel stressed and nervous, and I have no recourse. Never mind the all too frequent unpleasant experience of unavoidably seeing dogs defecate or urinate

Corr. ID: 4246

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209215

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My grandson, while walking at Chrissy field had food snatched from his hands by unleashed dogs.

Can dog owners be thoughtful enough to limit their animals to run where people are safe and no small children present? Several areas, so limit some for dogs and owners who will not endanger other people and children - not Chrissy field.

Concern ID:

30429

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having dogs present in the park significantly improves the visitor experience for many at the park, who either enjoy bringing their dogs, like being around other dogs, or feel safer with dogs and dog owners present. The park is unique within the NPS system. It should not be managed in the same manner as national parks. The visitor experience in the GGNRA should be one that includes dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1826

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191934

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: So I was greatly dismayed to hear the GGNRA is recommending severe restrictions on off-leash recreation. One of the reasons given in the DEIS report is that dogs detract from visitors' experience of the park. (p. 279-280) My experience is just the opposite.

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192037

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS inappropriately suggests that a dog policy inconsistent with the standard NPS policy is the source of all dog problems in the GGNRA. There is no evidence to support that statement. The DEIS also fails to characterize accurately the effects on visitor and employee safety and resource degradation from current dog walking practices. The DEIS should be revised to delete the suggestion that the NPS standard dog policy would eliminate any dog related problems and the DEIS should remove the negative characterization of dog walking from the Need for Action, based on the following:

i) The National Park Service (NPS) has a long tradition of managing dogs by severely limiting access to dog walking in national parks, typically requiring leashes at all times and restricting dogs to parking lots and paved roads, while banning dogs from trails and beaches. Throughout the document, the DEIS interprets a "national park experience" as an experience without dogs. The DEIS fails to recognize the unique character of the GGNRA and its urban setting.

Corr. ID: 1860

Organization: Self

Comment ID: 209622

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We only get positive remarks and smiles with our pug off-leash even though he can be known as a "picnic crusher" as visits people relaxing on blankets and walking about.

Corr. ID: 1862

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200289

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We walk OFF LEASH every day mostly at Baker Beach or at Crissy Field.

When the weather is nice we share our walks with everyone on the beach, the very young , the young, the old and every age in-between. When the weather is not so nice we are still there and usually it is only the dog walkers that are there. People love watching my dog catch his frisbee and frolic in the water. We have brought lots of smiles to lots of people.

Corr. ID: 3822

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204945

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs provide unconditional love and acceptance, unending entertainment, and motivation to get out of the house, exercise, unplug, and enjoy the real world. These are benefits to individuals and benefits to society. With all of the negative and harmful activities that take place on public lands, and throughout society in general, it is simply beyond reason why a positive and harmless activity has been selected for new rules and restrictions. For dog lovers, and there are a lot of us, our outdoor activities center around walking our dogs. We walk and explore together and we enjoy the freedom together. Banning dogs from certain areas and restricting dog walking to a leash only activity in other areas may seem like a ban or restriction on dogs, and that is bad enough, but the effect is that it bans a targeted group of people from those areas, and that is discriminatory and unreasonable.

Corr. ID: 3901

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205552

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA is an urban park. It allows people, their animals and nature to interact and live together. The Draft Dog Management plan fails to recognize the good that comes from these interactions-- that people enjoy nature and visit the park more, that these dogs are safer and better socialized and that they are a model for co-existence. In fact, I believe more land should be opened to on leash and off leash recreation as to better balance park usage.

Corr. ID: 4025

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207061

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have to say that rather than being bothered by the presence of dogs we and our dogs have been stopped on countless occasions with people - both locals and tourists - proclaiming how happy they are to be able to come to an area where they can enjoy the outdoors AND the presence of dogs (sometimes they are dog lovers who live in apartments where no dogs are allowed, so they come to the beach for their "dog fix"; other times tourists have spoken wistfully of their canine friends left at home and express appreciation for an opportunity to be reminded of them and to see dogs so well-integrated into the social life and recreational environments of the City).

Corr. ID: 4257

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209174

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My children are third generation Muir Beachers and we bring our dog Wanda down to the beach all of the time. The kids love it and Wanda absolutely loves it too! She loves socializing with the other dogs as much as she enjoys running free on the beach playing ball or Frisbee or whatever is in store for that day. I can't imagine what it would be like if this were no longer possible. Being able to spend quality time with my kids and dog at Muir Beach is one of life's greatest pleasures.

Corr. ID: 4533

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209692

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Plan/DEIS seems to focus on the "visitor experience" as one for people who don't want to be around dogs. However, not only are there people who go to the park with their dogs but there are people who go there without dogs to be around and enjoy interacting or observing the dogs.

It gives those people a wonderful visitor experience and that experience should be analyzed and acknowledged in the Plan/DEIS as well.

Concern ID:

30430

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Having dogs in the parks allows visitors to form social groups, and get out and visit these areas when otherwise they might . The dog-walking community significantly enriches the experience of many park users.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2125

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193407 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: He takes his dog every morning to Muir Beach where he meets his other (elderly) friends for socialization. This is his recreation. His dog + the dogs of his friends provide the motivation to get their exercise, the reason for socializing, safety and company on the walk to the beach.

Corr. ID: 3463 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203286 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I have been coming to Fort Funston with my dogs since 1985. I currently have 3 dogs, two of them rescue dogs. One of my rescue dogs, Cosmo, is a Border Collie/Golden Retriever mix and he is deaf. When we adopted Cosmo we were told that he would never be able to go anywhere off leash because of the increased danger of getting hit by a car, since he would never hear it coming. Cosmo has been going to Fort Funston for 8 years. He knows the territory and is very comfortable there. This is in contrast to the anxiety he experiences when he is in an unfamiliar environment, which becomes readily apparent by his change in behavior. Fort Funston is the only place in San Francisco where Cosmo can safely run and play off leash. Border Collies need to run daily and there is no possible way for them to run as much as they need to while on a leash.

In addition to the benefits that my dogs enjoy by spending time at Fort Funston, it is so vital to my wellbeing and the wellbeing of my fellow dog lovers. An hour at Fort Funston is filled with fresh air, laughter and exercise. You can't help but smile when you see all of the dogs playing. One of my rescue dogs is a 7 year old Bassett Hound named Sasha. I have always known that Bassett Hounds can move much faster than one would think, but this morning Sasha was playing with a very fast little dog. No one had ever seen a Bassett Hound run so fast and for such a long time. We couldn't stop laughing, and laughter is so rare and so healthy. Sasha needs to run to keep her weight down to avoid back problems down the road. She couldn't have played like she did this morning at a city park.

My third dog is a 5 pound Chihuahua named Schnecken. While she could get her exercise anywhere due to her petite stature, I have never seen her as happy as she was this morning. The weather was perfect and a wonderful time was had by all. It would be a tremendous loss if we will no longer be able to have such times again.

Corr. ID: 3597 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203719 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In the eight years that Sport and I visited Crissy Field, Ocean Beach or Fort Funston twice daily I created an amazing community of friends. Friends I still have today. These friends were of all ages, races, ethnicities, genders, sexual orientations and economic statuses. These friends got me through the grief and trauma of years of watching my friends die from AIDS that no support group or therapist could. I, like so many of my dog walking friends, were very conscientious about our dogs' behaviors towards birds, park visitors, and poop. The NPS, in this poorly constructed plan, are clearly trying to completely remove all dog owners, dogs, dog walkers or any other people who enjoy dogs from the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 4106 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208478 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: During that time, I've given birth to two children who consider FF to be their second home. As a family we have bonded with each other and with other similar-minded families. We even bring our 80-year-old neighbor every Tuesday because he loves to be around the unleashed dogs. It's a wonderful place that, if not for its off-leash access, we would not have had the privilege of

knowing and appreciating. Please continue to allow families like ours to enjoy this special open space with our dogs off leash.

Corr. ID: 4179

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208763

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Walking at Fort Funston I encounter people of just about all ethnicities, social classes, and orientations, brought together by their interest in socializing their dogs and enjoying the outdoors. I have never seen any kind of altercation like I regularly encounter in other City environments. Off-leash dog walking fosters a very special sense of community, which the DEIS will destroy.

I request that the DEIS be amended to study this historically significant community that has evolved in Fort Funston and other pockets of the GGNRA lands.

Corr. ID: 4320

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209438

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have never encountered a more cohesive, caring, self-policing, and diverse community. I have met other disabled and senior folks who visit Fort Funston for many of the same reasons I do. One woman told me she knows if she collapses on the trail due to her health condition (as happened to her once before), she and her dog will be taken care of by the people there. Finding this unique community has been essential to my wellbeing and I don't want to see it disappear.

Corr. ID: 4385

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209555

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have noticed that the vast majority of dog owners at Fort Funston, Baker Beach and Crissy Field, those areas we visit most frequently, are similarly careful and conscientious. Walking our dog with our friends is how we socialize, stay healthy and enjoy the outdoors.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

30431

Other user groups in the park cause far more problems than dogs and dog owners. Dog owners police each other to make sure waste is picked up and restricted areas are protected, improving the experience for visitors in the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 3637

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205056

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Most of the people with dogs I know or meet are equally positively affected by their dogs. In contrast, I've observed many uneducated adults and children littering, yelling and scaring wildlife, throwing rocks and sticks at or chasing animals, or cutting trails and causing erosion, leaving big ruts in trails with their bikes. No user group of the GGNRA is perfect. To punish dogs by taking away what little off-leash land they currently have is unreasonable and unfair. It will lead to problems between humans and dogs when dogs cannot be properly exercised and socialized and when humans are less exposed to dogs and therefore don't have the opportunity to learn how to act with dogs.

Corr. ID: 3911

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205578

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While walking my dog along the beach at Crissy Field I have even met people from other parts of the country who travel with their dogs and we often discuss how wonderful it is to bring dogs to such places and makes the Bay Area a unique place to visit. And if anything, dog owners including myself are quick to police each other when misbehaving dogs are about because the majority of us know the benefits and honor of having such wonderful places to share with each other are our canine companions. I hope the decision is given more thought to help keep both the on-leash and off-leash areas in tact.

Corr. ID: 4018

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206875

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My own experience on Crissy Field is that while dogs and their owners virtually never get in the protected dune areas of the beach I *often* see people unaccompanied by dogs laying out blankets and/or having a picnic or otherwise sitting in the designated protected areas, even when there are few if any other people or dogs (for that matter) on the beach (so that there are plenty of opportunities to sit on the beach properly unbothered - it seems simple to be a preference of folks to sit among the protected dunes). I say this to point out that I have witnessed far more instances of *people* violating protected areas at Crissy Field and elsewhere and very, very few instances of a stray impetuous dog trespassing in these areas.

Corr. ID: 4034

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207157

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog owners seem always on the look out for ways to be respectful to this important access to the natural environment, while I have witnessed many non-dog owners abusing the recreational privileges of the parks by littering or sitting, spreading a blanket or holding a picnic in areas that are meant to be protected and off-bounds to people and domestic animals. Enforce desired protections by citing both non-dog-owners and dog-owners alike who may be in violation. Though I'd venture to say very few are dog owners.

Corr. ID: 4236

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209242

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regarding the argument that some potential visitors choose not to visit the dog frequented areas of GGNRA due to fear of canines, I would respond that I, in turn, am precluded from those areas of the park which allow mountain bikes, for walking on such trails and needing to keep constant vigilance so as to be able to dodge any bikes bearing down upon me dampens greatly my pleasure in the hike. Yet I do not insist that all biking be outlawed for I comprehend the enjoyment of the bikers. Certainly there is room enough for us all? One percent of GGNRA park land devoted to off-leash dog use is certainly cannot be deemed an onerous compromise.

Corr. ID: 4236

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209240

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am not clear that dogs do any more damage than their human counterparts do. For instance, one day, after dogs were newly restricted to leashes-only along the northern section of Ocean Beach, I witnessed a youngster throwing rocks at the snowy plovers. The adults who accompanied him, presumably his parents, did nothing to stop him. At Ft. Funston, I have, on various occasions, watched teenagers etch their names into the sand dunes along the beach or looked on as people without dogs slide down the large dunes up top, an area ostensibly cordoned off. On the other hand, volunteers comb for dog feces on a monthly basis at Ft. Funston.

Corr. ID: 4253

Organization: Former Congressman

Comment ID: 209191

Organization Type: Federal Government

Representative Quote: We have hiked in the GGNRA and visited Crissy Field many, many times. We have rarely seen dogs stray into restricted areas- actually, children, teens, and homeless people are more likely errant in this regard. We have never seen any dog be aggressive to any human. There is the occasional very minor dog skirmish, which in our experience has never been more than a vocalization or body posture, which are totally normal and no cause for restrictions such as the ones you are proposing in the so-called preferred alternative.

Corr. ID: 4385

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209560 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: For example, the wildlife area of the beach of at Crissy Field frequently has hikers and families parked for the day in the dune areas where the snowy plovers are said to nest. These families have completely ignored the signs and often leave their trash behind. The dogs and their owners are by the water and on leash. Perhaps the GGNRA needs to provide an analysis that considers whether people should also be restricted from these areas or if recreating with and without dogs can only occur within X feet of the highwater mark, for example. This, of course, would include visitors for Fleet Week and other events.

Concern ID:

CONCERN STATEMENT:

30432

Some visitors who were participating in non-dog activities, like biking, horseback riding, or hang gliding, mentioned that their experience and activities had been impacted by having dogs in the same areas at the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 575

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 182079

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I felt that my experience of the mountain had been ruined. Indeed, I felt like I was in a video game, watching around every corner to see when next I would find myself confronted by a dog off leash, as if being attacked by asteroids.

Corr. ID: 1236

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 194894

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am even driven away from on leash areas due to the large number of off leash dogs in on leash areas. Runners can not run in areas with off leash dogs because dogs run after them and also often dart in front of them and cause them to stop running. It is very disruptive and makes it impossible for off leash dogs and runners to share the same space.

Corr. ID: 2088

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 200561

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a runner and cyclist who uses the Crissy Field promenade, East Beach, and Fort Mason areas several times per week. I have had several "near miss" encounters with both aggressive dogs and small yappy dogs off leash running at me, darting in front of me, and otherwise coming very close to injuring me both at Fort Mason and Crissy Field.

I also frequently launch my kayak off of East Beach, and have had negative and frightening labrador encounters. One time, a large dog swam up to my boat near shore and nearly capsized me, as the owner seemed unconcerned. I also regularly collect 3-4 gross abandoned dog-chewed tennis balls from the water when i'm out off east beach. This is yet another negative environmental impact that dogs are having.

I 100% believe that the current situation is unsafe and inappropriate, and i fully support the Park Service's proposal to bring dogs under better management, while still allowing some areas for off-leash use.

Corr. ID: 3514

Organization: fellow feathers

Comment ID: 201258

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I see dozens of dog walkers (commercial businesses!! how is that happening?) release their dogs and they first thing they do is squat and deficate right where I'm assembling my hang glider, the dog walkers cannot see every poop pile and 70% of the time they miss the pile. I basically like dogs but there are to many and the owners (a small number of them)just don't care or argue with you when you ask them nicely to pick up the pile of feces.

I support alternative C

Corr. ID: 4070 **Organization:** Mar Vista Stables
Comment ID: 207672 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Equestrians who ride on the beach and on Fort Funston proper have coexisted with dog walkers, hang gliders and other visitors for decades. In the past ten years, however, the lack of guidance and enforcement and inconsistent policies have led to increased incidents between off leash dogs and horses. While the majority of dog owners (including those who ride horses with off-leash dogs) keep their dogs under voice control, incidents have increased and continue to threaten the health and safety of other visitors. Because of the danger, many visitors choose not to frequent Fort Funston allowing the perception that the entire area is only a "dog park" and creating the feeling that the park service is violating their multiple use mandate by catering to a single user group.

Corr. ID: 4190 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 208789 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: "I know dogs can be such a distraction!" the lady with the large dog said with a friendly chuckle, a form of apology to several park visitors who were startled by the approaching animal. The people were doing tai chi in a grove of trees in the Presidio. The dog was off leash in an on-leash area. This happened several days ago.

Corr. ID: 4408 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 206406 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: At Fort Funston, I and a group of friends, while riding our bikes there, experienced a problem with dogs. We biked around Lake Merced and decided to ride up to the ocean overlook at Fort Funston. The path up was full of off-leash dogs and dog owners, standing and talking, making no effort to get out of the way, or to remove their dogs from the multiuse path. Some of the dogs barked and growled. We had to get off our bikes and walk. Weeks later, we tried this a second time, wondering if we had just hit a bad day, but the experience was the same. If dogs are going to be in the GGNRA at Fort Funston, they need to be on leash or in a fenced area. They are not compatible with other users of our national park.

Concern ID:
CONCERN
STATEMENT:

30434
The visitor experience section of the DEIS focuses on visitors who do not enjoy dogs, particularly minority, disabled, and elderly visitors. Commenters noted that this was not representative of these visitors, as many visitors enjoy seeing or having dogs at the GGNRA. Many visitors who bring their dogs to the GGNRA are minorities.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3504 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 201186 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Every time I have visited Ft. Funston over a ten year period, I have seen a wide diversity of people recreating there. Many of the dog owners I see at Ft. Funston are Latinos, Asians and African Americans, and the people range in age from children to people in their 80s. In fact, I see a more diverse group of people at Ft. Funston than I have ever seen at national parks that do not allow dogs. I often bring visiting family and friends from Mexico to Ft. Funston to see what a wonderful place we have for people who like to walk out in this beautiful part of San Francisco with their dogs.

The GGNRA is not a national park and it is not a pristine wilderness area. It is a recreation area. I oppose all of the proposed alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, because they all are an attempt to change these areas from recreation areas into national parks, which is in direct contradiction to the mandate under which San Francisco granted these areas to the GGNRA.

I support the 1979 pet policy and believe that new areas acquired by the GGNRA should also include large off-leash, voice controlled areas so that Bay Area residents and our dogs can recreate there.

Corr. ID: 4130 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208558 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan because the Visitor Experience section of the Draft Plan focuses on park users who don't want to be around dogs, including minorities, seniors and children.

I myself as a member of the minorities who visit GGNRA lands 4 days a week do not see such phenomenon described in the Draft Plan. In fact, many of my fellow Asian friends, with or without dogs, visit Ocean Beach and Fort Funston regularly.

Corr. ID: 4218 **Organization:** Save Off Leash, SFDOG, Sierra Club, Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 208915 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA states that children and elderly people are afraid, and that's why dogs must be restricted. Has the park service studied this? No. In fact, on any given day, I bet that a good half of the users of Fort Funston are over 50. On any sunny weekend, I bet that 1/3 of the families at Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field have both children and dogs with them. This is an educated guess, based on years of observation and fieldwork.

Corr. ID: 4218 **Organization:** Save Off Leash, SFDOG, Sierra Club, Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 208918 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The GGNRA states that people of color are afraid of dogs. When I go to these public areas, I see people of all races and nationalities. When I say this to people who are apparently of Asian, Hispanic, or Pacific Islander heritage, they roll their eyes. I'm regularly stopped in city parks by kids with parents in tow. If the parents don't speak English, we signal to make sure it's okay for their kids to touch my dogs. All their kids want to do is pet, play, throw the ball, and run.

Concern ID: 30435

CONCERN STATEMENT: Visitors who were negatively impacted by dogs in the park were not adequately addressed in the DEIS. These visitors included families with children, the frail, elderly, and disabled, among other user groups. Guide dogs were also negatively impacted by interactions with uncontrolled dogs in the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 413 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181580 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I also recently discovered that people with guide-dogs have not been able to enjoy the park due to attacks on the guide-dogs by other dogs. Because the laws are not enforced, disabled people are forced out of the parks. Please, protect this already discriminated against group. I urge the GGNRA to protect the wildlife and protect the park's visitors from dogs.

Corr. ID: 3892 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206176 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing in support of your limited dog management plan. I work in an area where I consistently have problems with dog owners disregarding the rights of other people and wildlife. Dog restrictions are routinely ignored and some go as far as claiming their dog is a "service animal" while the dog is pulling on its leash and exhibiting none of the qualities of a highly trained animal that provides an indispensable service to a person who needs it.

Please don't let this highly passionate and vocal special interest group get their way at the cost of other users and wildlife. Please consider the rights of people that are terrified of dogs and wildlife that may not continue to exist if dogs allowed to trample their limited habitat. Dogs should not have an inherent right to be off leash everywhere and your limited off-leash areas combined with the more appropriate city dog parks is more than reasonable.

Corr. ID: 4398 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209656 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: - Beyond ignoring park users with severe disabilities, you have also ignored a much larger constituency that includes the frail, the elderly, and parents with small children and people who legitimately fear dogs or those who simply want a dog-free experience in their recreation. It is the responsibility of the NPS to protect park resources for all its users, not to cater to pet owner preferences.

Corr. ID: 4545 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209801 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On a human scale, it should be possible to walk with frail people or young children and not be threatened by large untrained dogs or their anti-social owners. It should be possible to walk along the beach or path and be unmolested.

Concern ID:

30437

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Visitors noted that unleashed dogs were often present in areas that were designated as on-leash only, or areas where dogs are not allowed. Having so many dogs in these areas put many visitors who were not comfortable with dogs in a position conflicting with dog owners. These visitors felt uncomfortable under these circumstances.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 501 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181876 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: All of these occurrences are detrimental to the overall experience. They also place me in conflict with the dog guardians, a situation that I would prefer to avoid.

Corr. ID: 4256 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209182 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: My comment is that I am in favor of more restrictions on dogs because in my experience wherever dogs are allowed to walk trails on leash, 90% of dog owners will let them off leash. In Tennessee valley I have seen this more

times than I can count on the legal trail and the off limits trails. Dog owners always claim they didn't see the signs or came in from some mysterious trail entrance where there were/are no signs. The same holds true for Rodeo

valley. I regularly see dogs off leash on Rodeo valley trail, or on the illegal upper part (coming from the East parking lot across from the rifle range) where they can get to the legal Miwok trail. Some people I do believe are

genuinely confused, however I have seen on multiple occasions dogs/people crossing a meadow/saddle from Rodeo valley trail to get to Miwok trail, usually with the dogs off leash. I think the Miwok/Coastal trail/

Green Gulch should be off limits to all dogs for the sake of the Bobcats who live there.

Corr. ID: 4269 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209096 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: As a senior citizen, I don't feel safe when dogs are allowed to run free. I have been bitten, had my food taken, water shaken on me and had dogs running between my legs causing me to fall, while owners of the dogs did nothing to prevent these occurrences. And the owners disrespect posted signs and get defensive when they are pointed out.

Corr. ID: 4464 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208638 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In the Sutro Heights Park near my house, there are signs saying "Pets on leash" at each entrance, but it is rare to be there without seeing at least some unleashed dogs, and on several occasions I have seen at least 30, right on the main pathways

Concern ID: 31827

CONCERN STATEMENT: The methods used by NPS to measure visitors to the park and visitor satisfaction are flawed, and underestimate visitation by those with dogs. Baseline visitation must be established.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4640 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 227745 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: o For many of the sites, the GGNRA is not monitoring visitation on any level to determine whether the recreation value is being maintained, improved or degraded; and the park service is not showing how their management decisions for each site impact the recreation value for the current and future generations
o Using the 2002 population survey and self-reported visitation plus the visitation counting methodology that ignores many entry points, the GGNRA is significantly understating current and yearly visitation and thus is not accurately reflecting the impact of management decisions on maintaining the recreation values for current and future generations
o Not that visitation records baselines need to be established to determine whether how dog management plans impact overall park usage and site specific usage. For example, if a "no dog" area experiences a significant increase in visitorship due to the new policy and the area is overcrowded and yet other "voice-control" areas are underutilized or vice versa then the Park Service should re-evaluate the trail distribution in an attempt to maximize the number of people enjoying the parks and getting daily exercise

VU4000 - Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Enjoy Dogs

Concern ID: 30438

CONCERN STATEMENT: Visitors felt their experience while recreating with dogs would be lessened by having to be on-leash in many areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 31 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181491 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Please, please, please do not require leashes for dogs on the beaches!!! Walking a dog on leash on a beach is torture for both human and dog.

Corr. ID: 202 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180622 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Overcrowding in off-leash areas will effectively exclude older dogs like mine who cannot see or hear well, and therefore will, quite simply, be knocked down and quite possibly injured by the younger, more active dogs. My

dog likes to sniff and explore. I like to keep up a steady, rapid pace so that I derive full health benefits from my walk. My needs and that of my dog can only be mutually met if we are not joined by a leash.

Corr. ID: 1270 **Organization:** public

Comment ID: 194981 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If off-leash is restricted, I will likely move away because walking my dog on-leash is less safe for him as other dogs can attack him and he cannot get away. I also can not get as good of exercise with a leash in my hands.

Corr. ID: 2239 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200879 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: What having all dogs leashed does is takes away the joyfulness in bringing one's pet to a beach or a natural area (where endangering wild life is not an issue)

Corr. ID: 4455 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208509 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm concerned that without off leash access, however, responsible people and their dogs will not have adequate opportunity for recreation and exercise. Having places in the GGNRA where I can daily take healthy walks with my dog safely off-leash is an experience that cannot be replaced by standing in a small city park, or walking restricted by a leash.

Corr. ID: 4598 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210058 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Without access to the small amount of land in the GGNRA to which we currently have access, I am concerned that many dog and dog guardians will not have sufficient opportunity to exercise and socialize their animal companions.

Having increasing mobility problems, I try to walk frequently and purposefully as often as I can, and the hike from the Fort Funston parking area to the on-leash-from-here sign to the north makes an adequate distance. I would not want to take that walk having to control two dogs on leash. Their walking paces and needs are markedly different, and walking two on leash for that distance would be very uncomfortable for me. The dogs actually need more vigorous exercise than I can give them on leash. The current availability of paved trail and off-leash running at Fort Funston accommodates the recreational needs of citizens like myself quite well.

Concern ID:

30439

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The loss of off-leash dog walking in the GGNRA would negatively impact the lives of many dog owners, who enjoy taking their dogs on off-leash walks. These dog owners felt the restrictions would take away a valuable part of their lives and park experience.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1372 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195237 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: write to urgently request that you keep the GGNRA OPEN to dogs and off-leash dog walking where currently available. Please stop pushing this extreme proposal, a plan that will negatively impact me and my dog directly and so many of us who live in the Bay Area. There are so few areas left where we can exercise our dogs to meet their daily needs for running, play and exercise.

Corr. ID: 3841 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208753 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Sadly, a main part of the reason I love to frequent GGNRA locales is because they're off leash, and if that were to change I don't think I'd be as

inclined to use the spaces.

Corr. ID: 4656 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209832 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The people walking with their dogs that we see early every morning are every bit as environmentally conscious and appreciative of their surroundings as the theoreticians that drew up the proposed regulations. There are a number of us who sweep the beach each morning for unwanted debris. This consists of anything from non-dangerous, but unsightly pieces of styrofoam to more lethal objects like hypodermic syringes. We have also assisted in the reporting and protection of injured or sick sea lions and birds. In all the years we have enjoyed these walks, we have never seen one instance of dogs interfering with people walking on their own. On the contrary, the ones we meet all seem happy to greet us and our dogs

Please be aware of the irreparable damage that will be caused to the quality of life of those of us who frequent the recreation area on a daily basis, for whom these off-leash walks have become such an important part of our lives.

Concern ID:

30440

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The restriction of dogs into smaller areas will make the GGNRA less pleasant to visit for visitors with dogs, as they will be crowded, and there will be more incidents between dogs. Additionally, this plan would force dog owners to find alternative areas for walking, which may be hazardous.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1327 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195079 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The contraction of areas available for off-leash recreation will significantly compromise the park experience for people with dogs, and could lead to an increase in conflict as more and more people are forced into smaller and smaller areas. The impacts of people moving from the GGNRA into city parks is not adequately addressed in the DEIS.

Corr. ID: 1515 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190672 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In San Francisco county parks people and dogs interact fine. By limiting dog areas dogs and people will be more crowded causing tension and behavior problems which would impact the visitor experience. In order for dogs and people to get along there needs to be more space for dogs than the Pref. Alt.

Corr. ID: 3199 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203958 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm an Asian American woman and own a Bernese Mountain dog. She doesn't play fetch, doesn't particularly enjoy socializing with other dogs, but enjoys our hikes on the horse trails at Fort Funston, where we have been going on weekends for years. She ignores the horses and other hikers (unless they want to greet her, which she loves), and we would be lost without these trails. I would not hike them without a dog at my side, and they enrich both our lives beyond words.

The Preferred Alternative assumes all dogs are dog-park dogs, which is unrealistic and based on ignorance of dog behavior and individual personality. If the Preferred Alternative goes through, there will be an abundance more of dog/dog aggression in fenced in dog areas than the alleged incidences -that seem to be more annoyances - that are faced in off-leash areas currently.

Corr. ID: 4420 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207297 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are reasonable management strategies available to GGNRA to produce high levels of visitor compliance. The most effective: Do not eliminate most of the off leash area in the GGNRA. If reasonable areas exist for visitors to take real walks with their dogs, those visitors are not inclined to walk into unapproved areas. But in fact, all alternatives except Alternative A drastically reduce off leash area in the GGNRA, leaving small ROLAS where a walk is not possible. The small ROLAS also guarantee extreme crowding of visitors and their dogs, changing an important recreational activity into an unpleasant ordeal.

Concern ID:

30441

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The presence of dogs running around the GGNRA is something that many visitors liked to see. They felt that the proposed plan would take away from the atmosphere of the parks. Some commenters felt the plan would result in rangers having a more police-like presence in the park, which visitors felt would detract from their experience and their support of the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1758

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 191492

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly oppose the proposed draconian restrictions on off-leash dogs on GGNRA lands!

Although I don't have a dog myself, I am a frequent walker at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, and it is a great joy to watch the dogs there running, swimming, fetching, digging, and otherwise having a wonderful time.

I can't see anything positive at all that would be accomplished by the proposed restrictions, whereas they would cause a serious reduction in the quality of recreation on GGNRA lands.

Corr. ID: 2248

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 200983

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have been to Ocean Beach nearly every day for the past 20 years. I did not own a dog then, but one of my early joys was watching these magnificent beasts romp and run to their heart's content. I have had two retrievers since, and both have loved their beach experience

Corr. ID: 2771

Organization: Historian

Comment ID: 201089

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Historically, people in SF walked their dogs in many areas before they came under NPS control and NPS made an agreement 20 years ago with those people to allow dog-walking and to back out of that agreement now for legalistic reasons or to suit management's interests is dishonorable. It is the reason many people have grown a negative view of GGNRA because of its "BIG PARK" mentality. If you impose drastic restrictions on dog-owners you will be alienating many members of the public who would otherwise support increasing your resources.

Corr. ID: 3536

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 201297

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I hope you will consider keeping off-leash space in the GGNRA available for the use of pets and their owners. While problem dogs (and their negligent owners) are of course a very legitimate concern, changing the law will not dissuade these people. They will be there with their dogs no matter what any law says. Unfortunately the people that will be affected are the conscientious dog owners who will no longer have a healthy and pleasant way to exercise and enjoy Crissy Field, Fort Mason, and the rest of the GGNRA alongside their dogs. While problem dogs need to be dealt with, by other dog owners and by park law enforcement, it should be remembered that a well behaved, happy dog is often a

great enjoyment and source of happiness park visitors, even those unaccompanied by a dog of their own.

Corr. ID: 4313

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209383

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The purpose of this letter is to let you know as a resident of San Francisco and a frequent visitor to Golden Gate Park and Crissy Field, I really do not like your plan to further restrict dog walking in the parks. Although I do not personally own a dog I often walk my sister's dog and love to see dogs and their owners in the park having a great time. You must realize San Francisco is a "dog city" and we need to provide them places like Crissy Field to get some exercise, socialize and enjoy the beautiful beaches. Your Alternative C would be far too hard on dogs and their owners.

Concern ID:

30442

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed plan would negatively impact the recreational opportunities of dog owners in the GGNRA by limiting the spaces and freedom they currently have in regard to dog walking. Visitors who enjoy having dogs at the GGNRA felt they were not included as stakeholders in the decision-making process.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1152

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192893

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: It seems to me that it would be better to punish bad dog owners than to ban all dogs. To be able to romp unleashed in these beautiful hills is a great joy and to go alone would be a great sadness and I probably would not. I am growing elderly and I feel safer with my dog as well.

Corr. ID: 1289

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195020

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A host of reasonable, inexpensive and easy to administer changes have been proposed by interested groups supporting continuation of existing dog walking and off-leash parameters. These should be pursued, rather than the proposals recommended in the plan. The plan's proposals would adversely impact the experience of one set of users (dog owners), even though their numbers have grown and they pay the same taxes and fees as everyone else. We need and deserve a plan that treats all users equally.

Corr. ID: 1693

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191100

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is a huge population of responsible dog owners and their pets in Northern California. This plan seems to ignore this population, and their need for health, exercise, + enjoyment. There is already so little parkland that is available to dogs and their owners. And now that is going to shrink? Seems horribly restrictive + unfair. Many dogs need to run + play to get proper exercise, and that can't happen on a leash.

Corr. ID: 1931

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192271

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: -I am unclear as to where stakeholders' input was included in the ROLA designation.

-I would request an impact assessment beyond park boundaries, of implementation of these ROLA.

-Society is also an evolving stakeholder in land use decisions. Urban areas have higher concentrations of park guardians & dog recreation is a significant part of the guardians socialization. For elders & the handicapped, such socialization lowers depression. Many working in therapy dogs use off leash recreation, as well. These dogs are also stakeholders!

Corr. ID: 3222

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202605 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I regularly frequent dog parks around the city, including (but not limited to) Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach. These are areas where my dog can run freely, with or without other dogs, and be able to get the exercise he needs. We are able to keep him out of any protected habitat restoration areas (e.g. along Crissy Field), so that the natural wildlife is not disturbed.

Not only are these places critical for the well being of my dog (and those of countless canine companions in San Francisco), but it is the time within each week that I most look forward to, as it has become a part of my routine. It is important for my own health and well-being to not only enjoy these spaces, but to share them with my canine friend(s). I can't tell you how much enjoyment I receive from playing with my dog, having space to run and play ball, being outdoors, and enjoying nature and the wonderful parks and outdoor space that this city has to offer WITH MY DOG! Please don't take away this right of mine/ours. The intention of these spaces is to be used for BOTH recreation and conservation. I don't understand why we have to choose one over the other. To do so is both one-sided and short-sighted.

Corr. ID: 3748 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204610 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you limited the dog areas in your parks, it would definitely negatively affect our opportunities to enjoy nature together. There are many, many dogs in San Francisco and they deserve to have places to exercise along side with their families.

I think you should support maintaining the existing dog areas (both on- and off-leash) while looking for additional areas that could be used for dog activities. Public education and outreach would also be useful to show the public how to properly respect the GGNRA land.

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Representative Quote(s):

30443

Many visitors felt that if they could not bring their dogs to the park, they would likely not visit it in the future. Some commenters noted that they would consider moving out of the area entirely if the proposed plan was enacted.

Corr. ID: 322 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181083 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I adopted my dog specifically with the dream of spending weekend days outdoors with her, going for runs and generally living a healthy life. That has all come true but it will be a significant challenge and disruption to loose these spaces.

Corr. ID: 456 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181726 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If bans went into effect, I would be less likely to come to the park and look for alternatives throughout the bay area or within the city. I feel restricting dogs from the current regulations would decrease attendance at these parks resulting in fewer advocates for when it comes time to really have to preserve/save these areas because of budget cuts, etc.

Corr. ID: 515 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181923 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If I was unable to take my dogs I would not hike in these beautiful lands. Many people I have met in the last few weeks agree that we would not be on the trails without our dogs. If you ban dogs I believe you will loose more than half the hikers on the trails. Please don't take away this beautiful privilege from us.

Corr. ID: 3378

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203105

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm a mother of a toddler and a dog owner, and it is difficult to find places to go where I can bring both my son and my dog. Playgrounds, for example, are dog-free. But as a city-dweller with no backyard, I need to exercise my dog - as well as be active with my family. We frequently spend our weekend days at Fort Funston and Chrissy Field, where both my son and my dog can run and enjoy the outdoors. If dogs are no longer allowed in these locations, or if their presence is severely restricted (as I believe your plan aims to do) the result will be that my family and I simply won't visit as often.

Corr. ID: 3639

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205062

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: He is off leash for an hour, we both get our daily exercise, and it is pure joy for both of us. There is a wonderful community of responsible and dedicated dog owners who are there every morning. This makes city living possible - and enjoyable - for me. IF there were no off leash areas where we could exercise together and enjoy the surrounding beauty before I go to work every day, I would likely move out of the city.

Corr. ID: 3849

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208806

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I absolutely would move if I didn't have this available for my daughter, and being able to take both my dog and my daughter on a walk is a crucial part of the experience both from a logistics/scheduling standpoint and a life-enjoyment factor. From what I understand, this area was originally developed for recreation-and it seems clear from the dog ownership numbers in this city that people in this town really enjoy their canine companions. As it stands, only a small fraction of the GGNRA lands are open for off-leash recreation, and this new plan is vastly inadequate for the needs and clear desires of San Francisco residents.

Concern ID:

30444

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters supported alternative A, as it provides sufficient areas for dogs to run, which is necessary to serve the recreational needs of dog owners in the Bay Area. Visitors enjoy the park under the current rules and feel changing these rules would lessen their experience at the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 516

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181924

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support Alternative A, no change to dog walking requirements. I do have not a dog, but I appreciate how hard it is for dog owners to find spaces where their dogs can run. I take frequent hikes at some of the areas affected by this proposed change, and I enjoy the mixed human-dog environment. Any inconvenience to me is outweighed in my estimation by the benefit.

Corr. ID: 1342

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195173

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to formally select Alternative A (no action). I very much enjoy the parks as is. I would not use the parks at all if the proposed changes were made.

Corr. ID: 1392

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195300

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm a native San Franciscan and I don't have a dog. These proposals seem overly stringent -- dogs need to run off leash. I do hope that you re-consider and leave things as they are. People and their dogs need a lot of off-leash areas. These areas are too limited as it is.

Corr. ID: 2872

Organization: Bay Area Travel Writers

Comment ID: 202863 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have never experienced anything like Fort Funston in my entire dog-owning life. When I took Etta there for the first time, it was literally like we had arrived in dog heaven. The dogs - and their owners - were all ridiculously friendly and respectful, and Etta could finally run to her heart's content without the restrictions we've encountered in so many other places along California's coast.

As a travel writer, and the owner of a website with a section devoted specifically to traveling with pets, I can tell you that the appeal of having a place where dogs can run free is huge amongst dog-owning travelers. There are hundreds of thousands of people who make their decisions as to where to travel based on how pet-friendly a city is. San Francisco has set itself apart from other travel destinations for many reasons, but the availability of so many great leash-free zones for dogs is a significant contributor to the reputation of this city.

At a time when there are so many budget constraints on not only the state, but the county and city as well, do we really need to be spending time, money and resources on cordoning off areas that are dog-friendly and utilized by so many? I'm not sure why we are even having this debate in the first place. Everyone at Fort Funston (and the other areas under consideration for regulation) seem exceedingly content at having these wide, open spaces to enjoy with their families and family pets. So what, exactly, is the reason for changing the status quo? If the system isn't broken, why is are you trying to "fix it"?

I am firmly committed to promoting the city as a dog-friendly city. But if that changes, then I will be just as committed to letting my readers know that it is no longer a pet-friendly town. So I remain hopeful that here in San Francisco, we will be allowed to have our outdoor spaces remain as they are so that we can continue to enjoy the 'great outdoors' together.

Corr. ID: 3395 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203138 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to express my support for Alternative A, with site-specific, monitoring-based analysis on any new land additions to the GGNRA. It only makes sense to evaluate each site when deciding whether and in what capacity to allow dogs.

It saddens me to see how hostile the tone of the entire DEIS/Dog management plan document is toward dogs and their handlers. All too often management seems to conveniently forget that GGNRA has the word "Recreation" in it - and recreation includes dogs for a whole lot of people! The GGNRA sites are mostly located close to densely populated areas, and the reason most of them even exist is that at some point a trusting individual or family donated land to an organization such as POST, thinking that this would preserve the open space for all to enjoy. Unfortunately, all too often that land then gets locked away from public use and even when it's re-opened, the restrictions are often severe. I understand it is important to restore sensitive habitats for wildlife etc, but areas that have been used by people for decades, should remain accessible by all, at least for the most part.

Corr. ID: 4002 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206246 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The time my family and I spend outside with our dog has been a wonderful experience for all of us. Our lab is in voice control on most trails with few people and on leash where required or there are just too many people/dogs around. Either way, GGRNA has been the reason we live where we do. Please leave the dog laws as they have been.

Concern ID: 30445

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

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.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 736 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182712 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If the Dog Management Plan goes into effect, we lose a community. The dog owners in this city are, in general, a friendly group of people who enjoy getting to know each other and each others' dogs.

Corr. ID: 2006 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193211 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Many people won't go out without their dogs - self conscious seeking human company when along- dogs bring people from all social strata together in nature

Corr. ID: 2800 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201097 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge you to make no further restrictions on off-leash dog walking in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The opportunity to walk dogs off-leash provides a unique recreational opportunity for Bay Area residents such as me to exercise not only our dogs but also ourselves. In the process, we are able to meet and interact with diverse people from the community with whom we would not otherwise interact in our daily lives, such as at work or in our own neighborhoods.

Corr. ID: 2814 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201120 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I urge you to reconsider the current proposal to significantly limit dog walking areas in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area within San Francisco, particularly within Fort Funston.

In contrast, one of the wonderful things about Fort Funston is the feeling of community that exists. Everyone can enjoy the presence of the great number of dogs enjoying the ability to walk freely.

Everyone has a reason to reach out to other folks enjoying the park with a welcome and shared conversation; made possible by the common interest in and enjoyment of dogs.

In its current structure Fort Funston loosens the constraints of loneliness for many and, thus, Fort Funston improves the quality of life for dog owners and non dog owners alike.

The new structure with its greatly reduced on and off leash dog walking areas would separate us yet again and thus weaken the quality of life for San Franciscans and others who visit this area.

Please reconsider and keep Fort Funston available as an off leash walking area in its current formation.

Corr. ID: 3649 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204122 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The proposal represents an existential threat to most Bay Area dogs:

As near as we can tell, the proposal can be boiled down to "walking your dog off

leash will be banned on most Bay Area beaches". The proposal substantially reduces the quality of life for dog owners:

Dog owners are being asked to surrender their enjoyment of most public beaches. The proposal fails our senior citizens:

Many older owners, including ourselves depend on dog walking for exercise. The proposal fails our community:

The proposal unnecessarily creates deep divisions in our community. It has already spawned tremendous anxiety among dog owners, and gratuitously created deep seated animosity towards the National Park Service in particular, and environmental causes in general, that will be difficult to reverse. The proposal violates the terms on which the NPS originally took over management of GGNRA:

The NPS was charged with running the GGNRA as a recreation area, not as a national park. At the time that deal was made, dog walking was explicitly on the list of recreational activities the GGNRA was designed to accommodate. Dog owners would never in a million years have supported that original deal if they knew the NPS was even remotely capable of going back on it by producing a proposal such as the one before us today. The proposal wastes taxpayer dollars:

The cost of the study and the cost of defending against guaranteed lawsuits from dog owners, including ourselves, are projected to reach into the millions of dollars.
Conclusion:

Based on the above, we feel strongly that this disgraceful proposal should be either withdrawn or completely rewritten (in English this time) to take the above points into account and to expand off leash access at Bay Area beaches. As it stands now it is fatally flawed in all of the ways described above, and we are shocked and outraged that as taxpayers we have participated in funding a work product this shoddy, incomplete, biased, and frankly, witless.

Corr. ID: 3798

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205340

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A very large number of seniors have dogs and walk them at Fort Funston (and no doubt other GGNRA areas). I personally see and walk with more than eight every morning between 6:45 and 8:30am. The eldest of my friends is 88 and walks daily with her shepherd. You will be removing an important social and fitness benefit from many lives if you so severely restrict off-leash dog access.

Corr. ID: 4239

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209235

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I oppose the preferred alternatives in the DEIS regarding dog walking in the GGNRA lands and future lands to be acquired. First, I mourn the loss of community that will result as I and other citizens that walk their dogs in the GGNRA are no longer able to meet and walk our dogs off leash together there. This will have a major impact on my life as nearly every friend I have is someone I met at Fort Funston. My social life revolves around walking my dog at Fort Funston. I have built up a network of friends that I see at Fort Funston as I and my dog take our daily exercise there. To lose that is to essentially lose my entire social life. As I understand it, the historic use of Fort Funston, for about the last 40 or 50 years, is as an off-leash dog park. Please allow this historic use to continue.

Corr. ID: 4386

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209565

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: For another, given my mental and physical condition, I live a relatively isolated life. I've been able to meet people, get to know them and

their dogs, and now I'm at the point where the only socialization I get is within these groups. I value that highly, and I know most of us won't frequent these areas without our dogs and I will lose contact with those friends. I'm uncomfortable in most social situations and don't have visitors to my home, so I would be even further isolated if I couldn't take my dogs to the beach.

Corr. ID: 4645

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208979

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS treats the GGNRA as if it is a pristine National Park - however - the GGNRA is an urban recreation area. I have made some of my closest friendships within the dog community at Fort Funston. Lasting friendships that have continued for years throughout the lives of many dogs, miscarriages, pregnancies, deaths and graduations. For me, the GGNRA provided a community that I could go to daily at the same time and walk with the same people (and our dogs). Every day, I had a community where I could share my struggles and be heard and listen to other's struggles and offer my support. This is what life should be like. The GGNRA areas in San Francisco are communities with a culture based upon a shared recreational activity - off-leash dog walking. This culture provides our community with places to exercise our dogs, while enhancing the social, physical, emotional and spiritual aspects of being human. The openness of the lands of the GGNRA offer what few city parks are able to - and the mass numbers of dogs and people who would need to use city parks if they were unable to utilize GGNRA lands would be unbearable.

Concern ID:

30446

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Many dog walkers would not come as frequently to the GGNRA if the areas where dogs are allowed were restricted. Visitors noted that without the presence of these dog walkers in the parks, the parks would be much emptier, and they would not feel safe visiting them.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 859

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 186254

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel quite strongly that the proposals to greatly diminish the off leash areas of the GGNRA is bad for the people of San Francisco, dog owners and non-owners alike. all I can imagine is an empty, run down park that without the many, many, dog walkers I probably would no longer feel safe visiting.

Corr. ID: 1144

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192878

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog owners and walkers are responsible persons. Would there be increased alcohol consumption or drug use at these beaches by persons who do not need to be responsible (since they are not with dogs) and conscious of their surroundings? Would these people go to the bathroom in vegetative areas?

Corr. ID: 1709

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191139

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 1) The ability to bring a dog w/me on my walks allows me to use the trails. It is safer on many levels..I wouldn't go on many trails alone without my dog.

Corr. ID: 1750

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191216

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you put in only dogs on leash the dog people will stop coming - why would they come they can walk their dogs on leash on the city street. You are alienating and losing an entire group of free garbage collectors and safety people. Real shame. I won't come if you make these changes. I don't own a dog - never have. But I feel safe.

Concern ID: 30447
CONCERN STATEMENT: Having a fence along Oakwood Valley Trail will lessen the wilderness experience of visitors to the park, including those that do not have dogs with them.

For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29235 (OV1200), Comment 193389.

Concern ID: 30448
CONCERN STATEMENT: Having dogs on leash, as proposed under alternative B, would make the parks more enjoyable for responsible dog owners to visit, as they would not have to deal with uncontrolled off-leash dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1165 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193534 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I fully support adopting NPS leash regulation (Alternative B) outlined in GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan.

As a long-time dog lover and dog owner, I avoid GGNRA off-leash areas, partly because of the obvious degradation to the landscape wrought by dogs and their less-than-attentive owners, but mostly because I am sick and tired of dealing with people who don't have their dogs under control.

Corr. ID: 1183 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193561 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: please stand firm on leash laws and restrictions on loose dogs in all GGNRA areas. those of us who walk our dogs on leash, walk alone or ride horseback are tired of having to deal with out of control dogs running up to us.

Corr. ID: 2075 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200546 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I understand peoples' desire to let their dogs exercise off-leash, but this is a safety issue. Both of my dogs have been attacked by dogs that their owners claimed were "harmless" in dog parks and I no longer go to places where dogs are allowed off-leash because the don't feel safe. These parks are meant for people to enjoy and they should be able to do so without feeling threatened.

Concern ID: 30449
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters said that they would ignore the proposed restrictions if they were enacted, and would instead break the law at the risk of getting a ticket. Other visitors felt that non-compliance would increase if dog owners were not provided ample room for legal off-leash dog walking, so the laws would only negatively impact those who follow them already.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1186 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193565 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you succeed in banning dogs on Ocean Beach, I will ignore the law. So will most people. If you are going to give me a ticket for walking my dog on a public beach next to my house, I am not going to bother leashing him, since you are going to give me a ticket anyway. I will still clean up after my dog, because I care about my beach. Like a lot of dog owners, I pick up trash on the beach when I'm out walking my dog. My guess that we probably pick up more trash than we leave as a whole. When I see another dog owner not cleaning up after their dog, I speak to them. I don't like dog waste and litter on the beach either. I love my beach. I love my dog. I'm not giving up either without a fight.

Corr. ID: 3989 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207372 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Further, by my observation and in my experience, there are

quite a number of restrictions on off-leash use of GGNRA land already in place, but enforcement seems to be the real issue. I fear that if these more restrictive regulations are enacted, it will only be the law-abiding dog owners who will suffer; the scoflaws won't care about the new restrictions--just as they don't follow existing laws now.

I have also observed that when people and their families walk with their pets, they are more open to meeting other people, usually via inquiries about their pets. In the years we've had our dog, we've met more people and engaged in pleasant conversations with strangers than I have ever experienced in all my years before owning a dog. I truly believe pets can bring out the best of humanity in us all.

Concern ID: 30450

CONCERN STATEMENT: Visitors who enjoy dogs, but are disabled, would be unable to walk their dogs in many areas due to the design of the proposed restrictions.

Representative Quote(s): For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29419 (FF1200), Comment 195006, and Concern 29658 (SA1100), Comments 208770 and 209291.

Corr. ID: 3781 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205178 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Most of the recreational visitors to Ft. Funston will therefore be extremely negatively impacted by the preferred alternative at Ft. Funston. My wife is disabled. I will not be able to walk with my wife and our off leash dog, (or on leash dog) at Ft. Funston with your preferred alternative.

Concern ID: 30451

CONCERN STATEMENT: Although visitors liked dogs generally, many expressed that the current situation was out of control with dogs in the GGNRA. These visitors felt some more restrictions would benefit all users, and supported the proposed alternatives, including alternative C, at various sites.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 75 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181835 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree 100% with the restricted area's for dogs in the Presidio, Crissy Field area of the San Francisco Bay, it's about time! I love dogs but over the last couple of years its really gotten out of control there, children play in the sand where dogs do their business and run all over the place, while most owners aren't paying much attention. Also, dog fights break out often, causing adult frustration and arguments, I hope this helps the situation.

VU4005 - Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Do Not Enjoy Dogs

Concern ID: 30452

CONCERN STATEMENT: Some visitors felt that they would not want to have an experience that included off-leash dogs anywhere in the GGNRA except in designated areas. Having these areas so that visitors that do not enjoy dogs can avoid them would provide a better park experience.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 244 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180811 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I feel all dogs need to be on leash in all public parks, except in designated fenced areas. I do not wish to encounter dogs anywhere in parks, possibly excepting on leash with owners required to pick up their leavings.

NO DOGS!

Corr. ID: 281

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180945

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Such a program would also allow park rangers and law enforcement officers to more easily enforce the rules of the ROLAs. Although the ROLAs will allow for separation between those visitors with and without dogs, it might also offer benefits to the latter group by reducing their concerns, causing fewer complaints and perhaps even encouraging visitors who might otherwise avoid the GGNRA.

Corr. ID: 2673

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195518

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Unregulated, unleashed dogs in GGNRA is destructive to the environment and endangered species. It also creates problems for other users of the park, like me, who prefer peaceful enjoyment more than tripping over (and being bitten by) unleashed dogs.

The GGNRA should restrict unleashed dog areas in the parks. There is a space for all sorts of activity in the park, and dog owners also need to respect use limits. I encourage you to designate limited and specific areas for unleashed dogs.

Corr. ID: 2791

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201140

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I 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.

I have visited GGNRA beaches regularly for the past thirty-two years. Since the birth of my children, I have been particularly aware of the problems dogs pose to other beach users. When my children were infants, they were routinely bothered, terrorized, or knocked down by dogs chasing a ball thrown by its master or by a pack of out-of-control, "happy" dogs playing. If, after such incidents, I had a dollar for every time an oblivious dog owner said that their dog was friendly and loved children, I would be a very rich man. I grew tired of having to console my crying daughter after she was chased and/or knocked over by a dog at the beach. This was especially problematic at Crissy Field, so much so that we had to stop using the park entirely. This is not a live and let live situation - there are victims here.

I think that dogs should be banned from the GGNRA beach areas or be required to be on a leash. There are hundreds of acres in the nearby parklands for dogs to run free. Unrestricted off-leash dog access to the beaches is unacceptable due to the disruption and hazard it poses to individual users (especially children) of these natural areas.

Concern ID:

30453

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Having dogs allowed in the GGNRA compromises the experience of visitors at the GGNRA who do not enjoy interacting with dogs. Visitors felt that many areas they previously enjoyed had been significantly degraded from the presence of dogs. Areas with dogs, particularly off-leash dogs, should be decreased.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 245

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180812

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I've reviewed your alternatives, and hope the options selected work out.

I just wanted to let you know there are also members of the community that are anti-dog, of which I am one.

The experience at the park is compromised when dogs are present.

Corr. ID: 3254 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202751 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Not only do off-leash dogs on beaches disturb wildlife, especially nesting birds, they also foul the beaches, annoy those of us just out for a peaceful walk along the shore and generally make noisy, dirty nuisances of themselves.

I have always hated dogs, and I don't think I'm the only person on the planet who feels this way about them. They are noisy, dirty, and destructive and should NOT be allowed to run loose on beaches where endangered birds and animals should have precedence over a few people who think it is their "right" to roar around on motor vehicles and/or let their dogs run loose.

Corr. ID: 3373 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203098 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support any action the NPS can take to lessen the presence of unleashed dogs within the boundaries of GGNRA. I have been attacked by dogs twice in the past and when I see dogs unleashed it causes apprehension as I am walking along the trail. In fact, if I see an unleashed dog I usually walk the other way or stand to the side as the animal passes. So, my first reason for requesting a ban on all unleashed dogs from the park is the negative impact that unleashed dogs have on people, diminishing our ability to enjoy the trails of GGNRA. As one of the goals of the Park Service is to promote the enjoyment of our national parks, the presence of unleashed dogs prevents enjoyment for a significant number of people.

My second reason for opposition to unleashed dogs is the impact on wildlife, especially species that are on the endangered species list. While most dogs don't stray into areas where endangered species are located, there is enough of an impact from straying dogs that scientists have determined that there is a negative impact. We cannot allow a "tragedy of the commons" in GGNRA by allowing large numbers of people to unleash their dogs. It is simply not a good idea.

If the NPS determines that some accomodation must be made to the dog owners, then I hope that unleashed dogs will ONLY be allowed in areas with high fences that prevent the dogs from straying into sensitive habitats.

Lastly, those who violate the rules should be fined in a way that makes it clear that the NPS is seroius about protecting the resources of GGNRA. In other words, a stiff fine would be appropriate.

Corr. ID: 3628 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204111 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please, please do not allow dog owners more use of public lands to have their dogs off leash, Please lessen their off leash dog use as much as possible. As it is, almost every park in the Bay Area is open to dogs, including watershed land, right next to reservoirs. The few areas requiring dogs be on leash or are restricted to dogs are ignored. When I was a docent with Audubon for the Burrowing Owls in Berkeley, where people had a large off leash area, most still would not put their dogs onleash near the owls.

It doesn't matter how many people are threatened or attacked by dogs, or how many of us plead with dog owners to have control of their dogs, no public area is truly safe. But we have the choice to never go to the parks -- it's even more upsetting for native animals who have no where else to live, who are tormented, injured, and killed by dogs. Really, we need some place where wild animals and we also are safe from dogs and dog feces. We need to be able to go to parks and not worry about having to face groups of snarling off leash dogs. The only way for this to happen is

to have more laws restricting dog use, and to actually enforce them.

Concern ID: 30454

CONCERN STATEMENT: The proposed regulations would benefit those visitors who feel that that presence of unregulated dogs at many sites in the GGNRA hinders their time spent at the site, or prevents them from visiting the parks.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1044 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192121 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm for more restrictions on dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I'm a 63 year old San Francisco resident. I used to frequently visit Crissy Field but haven't been there in a long time. A few weeks ago I did make a new attempt but as I drove up saw two dog-walkers with 5-10 dogs each, and thought to myself this is not a place to enjoy a walk.

There are just too many dogs. A person with several dogs cannot keep them under voice control.

Too many people let their dogs run loose along the main walk ways. They may think their dogs are nice and well-controlled but not all people think that.

Not everyone likes dogs. Some people have had very bad experiences with dogs attacking them, biting them, even mauling them.

Corr. ID: 1078 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192212 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am strongly in favor of the draft plan. I am in favor of strong leash laws, and even limits on the number of dogs that are allowed in some areas. Dogs stimulate fears and that destroys the enjoyment of serene environments. For example I am thinking of the beautiful stretch of beach at Crissy Field, from the Marina to Ft. Point. It is really terrible for walkers to encounter so many dogs there, especially those that are not on leashes. Also the dogs are dirty. And they scare the young children that are brought to the recreational areas. Put simply they simply destroy the experience.

Corr. ID: 1164 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193533 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am in support of the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan.

Another very upsetting point is regarding Fort Funston. The place is completely taken over by dogs - not just a single owner with a dog or two, but dog walking "services" with 5-10 dogs each. I decided to go running on the trails there a few weeks ago and couldn't take more than a dozen steps without being surrounded by dogs. It looked like a kennel and was just a complete waste of a beautiful property. I had to turn around and leave. I won't be going back there, or even recommending it to friends, until something is done.

I sincerely hope the Dog Management Plan moves forward so San Francisco residents can enjoy land that has since been taken over by dogs.

Corr. ID: 1244 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194927 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the NPS preferred alternatives for dog management. I want the ability to observe the birds, sketch the views and plants and feel safe. I fear for myself and children being knocked about, nosed and licked by frolicking dogs because I have seen this happen. Having approved areas where I can

choose to be or not to be around dogs meets my needs.

Corr. ID: 2217 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200786 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I just for once would like to walk on the beach and not have a wet sandy dog run up and jump on me or run across my blanket while I am eating. Please help!

Corr. ID: 3128 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201561 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support the proposal to restrict off-leash dog activity in the park. Free-roaming, off-leash dogs are fundamentally incompatible with the purposes of a national park because they harass and endanger the wildlife that is supposed to be protected. They also mean that no other park user can peacefully enjoy their own multi-use experience of the park because the guaranteed out-of-control behavior of just a few dogs destroys that possibility.

Concern ID: 30455

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters noted that leash laws or banning dogs from certain areas would provide a better experience for those visitors that do not enjoy interacting with dogs. Having dogs present in the parks may impact the safety and experience for some visitors.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 309 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181053 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs off leash are a real problem in the GGNRA. I have personally seen dogs digging up wildlife in the GGNRA and harassing birds. I fully support more leash laws or banning dogs from certain areas (or from the whole park) to protect the wildlife. I also support leash laws or banning dogs from certain areas to create dog free space for people who are uncomfortable with dogs to enjoy.

Corr. ID: 431 **Organization:** GG Parks Conservancy

Comment ID: 181620 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We are very frequent visitors to the GGNRA and long-time members of the GG Parks Conservancy. We love to hike, ride our bikes and enjoy the beaches. Dogs significantly detract from our enjoyment of the park areas. Therefore, we support stringent regulations of dogs - they should be kept entirely out of most areas and, where they are allowed, they should be leashed at all times. The only situation where they should be allowed to run free is within a fenced off dog run area.

Corr. ID: 1273 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 194987 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to see more dog free zones created and enforced. My husband is disabled and it is important that he walks. He needs a cane because he is unstable and is easily caused to fall. He fell in the park because he a dog ran up to him and jostled his cane. Luckily he was on a soft surface and suffered no fractures. However, in a slightly different location the outcome would have been much worse. He no longer goes to the park for this reason.

Corr. ID: 1383 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195262 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the GGNRA Dog Management plan. Many dog owners on the beach cannot control their own dogs. I go fishing at Baker beach every weekend and every time I have dogs sifting through my belongings and urinating all over my fishing gear. It is ridiculous. Dogs should be on a leash at all times.

Corr. ID: 2886 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202924 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am so pleased with the draft dog management plan as it allows places for me to take my family were I don't have to worry about dogs taking over our space, barking, going to the bathroom and otherwise having dog parties. Each time I take a walk in GGNA I am on defense of all the dogs running around and going to the bathroom. It is most intense when dog walkers have a large pack running free and the ratio of owner to pet is 8:1. I think the well planned areas allow for plenty of space for dogs to run free and more importantly allows space for people to enjoy the beautiful natural resources of GGNRA.

Concern ID:

30456

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Dogs should be on-leash in the GGNRA to protect resources and provide a better experience for visitors who may not feel comfortable with off-leash dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 333

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 181099 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Where are regulations regarding cats?

My concern about waste from cats and dogs adds to my fear of dogs. I like dogs, but when I see dogs and packs of dogs running together, perhaps towards me, I become anxious. I believe that domestic animals should be kept on leash or tether unless on their owner's fenced property.

Corr. ID: 1794

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 200287 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dogs, both on leash and especially off leash, have negative impacts on birds and other wildlife. Off leash dogs can inhibit visitors from feeling comfortable and enjoying areas of the GGNRA, particularly the beach at Crissy Field, all of Fort Funston and most of Ocean Beach. Fort Funston is so totally overrun by dogs that it can no longer be enjoyed for hiking and bird watching. In the GGNRA dogs should always be on leash. Compliance needs to be strictly enforced, 100%. Commercial dog walking should not be allowed in the GGNRA. Habitat and wildlife preservation should always be the priority for the GGNRA. Greater restrictions on dogs are overdue and badly needed.

Corr. ID: 3843

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 208757 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Earlier this month while walking along the beach of Crissy Field, I was startled several times by unleashed dogs that came up behind me barking, this is not the first time this has happened to me and frankly does not add to my experience at the beach. On this particular walk I was almost knocked over by a dog as it ran into me chasing a ball. If the dogs were leashed I believe that I would not have been barked at and almost knocked over because people have more control over the dogs.

Concern ID:

30457

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Alternative D would be the most favorable option for visitors who do not enjoy dogs in the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 100

Organization: Not Specified

Comment ID: 181936 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I AVOID and DO NOT USE Chrissy Field and other areas of the GGNRA which are overrun with off-leash dogs. It is scary, annoying, and full of dog poop.If the GGNRA chooses to establish fenced, contained, off-leash dog-run areas (preferably segregated by dog size), that's great. Otherwise, all dogs in the GGNRA should be on a leash. I prefer Alternative D in the EIS.

Concern ID: 30458
CONCERN STATEMENT: Visitors supported restrictions on dogs, but worried that the proposed regulations would increase their negative experiences with dogs in other areas of the GGNRA, local dog parks, and on city streets as dog owners would likely walk their dogs in these areas if they were restricted in the GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1393 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 195310 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: There is a very large unleashed grass area where dog owners can allow their dogs to run, play catch and roam freely where people without dogs do not even go. While this area is large it is often at capacity. I think reducing the number of unleashed dog areas in recreational areas of SF will pose a potential safety threat to non-dog owners and children and result in further damage to the terrain of our natural spaces which are so precious in an urban environment. An increase in the number of dogs to Stern Grove due to closures in other parks would increase all of the aforementioned concerns.
Corr. ID: 1435 **Organization:** Golden Gate Mothers Group
Comment ID: 195623 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I have a small child and we use the GGNRA regularly. I am very concerned that if you close the offleash areas then there will be more conflict between dogs and kids. As it is they are fairly separate, but make the dogs go on leash and they will move from the waters edge, and on to the walks with the strollers. NOT GOOD. I prefer the dogs playing with each other, tiring each other out, not on the paths getting tangled up and knocking my child over.

Concern ID: 30459
CONCERN STATEMENT: The fencing on Oakwood Valley trail will negatively impact the visitor experience of all visitors, including those who do not enjoy dogs.

For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29235 (OV1200), Comment 193389.

Concern ID: 30460
CONCERN STATEMENT: The presence of dog waste in areas was cited as a major reason that many visitors did not enjoy having dogs in the GGNRA, and was one reason these commenters supported restrictions on dog walking.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2057 **Organization:** None
Comment ID: 200544 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I fully support the Nps preferred alternative in this eis. There are plenty of places for dogs, but only a few for rare wildlife. Also, dogs detract from experiences in nature as their owners don't always pick up their waste and when they are off leash, they could be especially disruptive. Park services lands are the prize of the public lands system and the highest priority should be given to preserving wildlife and their habitats and conserving the natural elements that make experiences in the national parks so special for all.
Corr. ID: 2280 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 201075 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I agree with the plan to exclude dogs from Rodeo Beach, whether off or on leash. Dogs and their owners have reduced my activities and visits to this beach. After my youngest son was bitten by a dog (not at Rodeo) he was afraid of dogs for a few years and we stayed away from beaches that permitted dogs off leash. But my main objective is dog owners not cleaning up dog poop. By fall the beach sand at Rodeo is full of dog crap.
Corr. ID: 2651 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195455 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The National Park Service number one priority should be to the wildlife in the area. Please restrict off leash areas. Irresponsible dog owners have riddled the area with dog poop and made the area unpleasant for people who do not have dogs to visit. The few times I have visited Fort Funston I have been disgusted by the amount of dog poop on the grounds. I have not returned in over a year. It is too bad that a handful of irresponsible and unpleasant dog owners can ruin the area for everyone.

Corr. ID: 3024 **Organization:** Golden Gate Raptor Observatory,
California Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 201002 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Finally, as a frequent volunteer/visitor, I get really disgusted and have zero tolerance for dog poo that's left behind, and just the possibility of it makes my visits to the beach much less enjoyable. For this reason alone, I think that at least half of your beaches should be dog-free.

Concern ID: 30461

CONCERN STATEMENT: [The preferred alternative does not provide enough trails for visitors who enjoy hiking the trails without dogs, or other areas for those visitors who seek a dog-free experience. Under the proposed plan almost all the trails in San Francisco allow dogs on-leash on trails.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2382 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202168 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The park should better accommodate diverse park user groups, such as runners, horseback riders, families, and those with service animals, by offering more than one trail and more beach areas free from dog recreation

Corr. ID: 3525 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society

Comment ID: 201274 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: While dogs are an important part of our communities, they are domestic creatures that are having a significant negative impact on thousands of other animals and plants that rely on the park to survive, including some threatened and endangered species. The parks should be maintained to be safe and accessibly for all users and to protect our cultural and natural resources for future generations.

Certain trails in San Francisco should be entirely closed to dog-use. Under the current plan, nearly every trail in San Francisco is open to on-leash dogs, leaving 0 trails available to public use without the presence of dogs.

Corr. ID: 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208886 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation
Representative Quote: 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.

Corr. ID: 4410 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206942 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The plan does not provide an adequate amount of hiking trails and picnic areas where visitors can enjoy a dog-free, National Park quality experience. Within San Francisco, the plan provides no significant area where park

visitors can spend the day hiking and/or picnicking in a dog free environment. A solution to this problem would be to designate all of the coastal bluff areas, from the Golden Gate Bridge to and including Baker Beach, as a dog-free zone.

Corr. ID: 4665 **Organization:** National Parks Conservation Association

Comment ID: 209146 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The current status-quo fails to provide equity to park users, as there are limited areas in the GGNRA, San Francisco specifically, where one can have a dog-free experience. Currently, if a family would like to have a dog-free beach experience in GGNRA, only one beach in the GGNRA, the small China Beach, allows for it.

Concern ID: 30462

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Enforcing the current regulations would provide adequate protection for those visitors who do not enjoy interacting with dogs.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2877 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202893 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I enjoy walking Crissy Field on a regular basis. While many dog owners are respectful - there are many who allow their animals to run in areas clearly marked otherwise. I have had dogs off leash jump up on me, run into me - while the owner only offered a limp "sorry". All could have been avoided with a leash or taking the animal to a designated area to run free. I don't believe new regulation is needed - just enforce the laws all ready in place.

Corr. ID: 2890 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202970 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am very concerned about the fact that the current boundaries for the off-leash area are not currently being enforced. Young children and older adults should be able to use the area without concern of being attacked or even just knocked over by off-leash dogs

Concern ID: 30480

CONCERN STATEMENT: [Commenters felt that visitors who did not enjoy dogs had other areas to visit in the parks and local area.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 248 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180820 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Bottom line it seems that the biggest concern is for people who do not prefer dogs and I think they should avoid those areas that they know there is a possibility that they might run into dogs (and that doesn't mean that people who let dogs off-leash shouldn't be responsible for their dogs being trained to obey voice commands to leave people alone and generally behave politely) and go to the MANY other places that they can enjoy the same activities where dogs are not allowed.

Corr. ID: 1554 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190743 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do understand that many people either do not like or are afraid of dogs. They, however, have many options, ie: China Beach - no dogs allowed.

This is an URBAN Recreation Area, not a wilderness area & people will always have dogs.

VU4010 - Visitor Use and Experience: Actions of Dog Owners

See comments under VU2010 - Visitor Use and Experience: Affected Environment; VU4000 - Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Enjoy Dogs or VU4005 - Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Do Not Enjoy Dogs

VU4015 - Visitor Use and Experience: Concern Statement of a Dog Owner

See comments under VU4000 - Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Enjoy Dogs

VU4020 - Visitor Use and Experience: Concern Statement of a Non Dog Owner

See comments under VU4005 - Visitor Use and Experience: Impact of Proposal and Alternatives on Visitors who Do Not Enjoy Dogs

VU4025 - Visitor Use and Experience: Professional Dog Walkers

Concern ID: 30465

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters oppose or are concerned that professional dog walkers are running a commercial business free of charge at GGNRA at the cost of others and the park. It has been suggested that commercial dog walking should be prohibited at GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 537 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 181948 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Literally hundreds of times, dogs have jumped on me while I run or hike. I consider this a serious invasion of privacy. I have also been tripped, or dangerously nearly so, numerous times. I regularly see dogs chase rabbits and other wildlife. Whether they catch the animals or not, surely they wreak havoc on their lives and breeding. Professional dog walkers run their commercial business free of charge on GGNRA and other public lands, passing the cost on to other users. The sheer number of dogs and dog walkers overwhelms many trails and trailheads. And when rules and laws are so flagrantly broken, as dog owners--more than anyone else--so brazenly do, no one can really feel safe in the open space.

I applaud the GGNRA draft plan's efforts to restore reason and science to this out-of-control off-leash dog problem

Corr. ID: 1522 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 190687 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 2) Commercial dog walkers should not be allowed. The Park purposes do not include those activities.

Corr. ID: 2133 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 193426 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 3. Commercial dog-walking should not be permitted in the GGNRA. This is a commercial activity in the park and the Park Service cannot legally permit it.

Corr. ID: 2238 **Organization:** Not Specified

Comment ID: 200876 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Professional dog walking in the GGNRA should be either banned or drastically limited.

---- You Should Not Be Able To Make Money Consuming National Park Resources

Corr. ID: 2330

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201949

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree that commercial dog walkers should not be allowed in the parks. These businesses should manage the dogs in their own proprietary fenced areas, or they can walk them on the city streets.

Corr. ID: 2905

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202625

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Commercial dog walking should not be allowed. Commercial dog walking does not relate to the purpose and mission of the National Parks. Commercial dog walking provides no service or benefit to park users, has negative impacts on park resources and park visitors, and serves only for the capital gain of private enterprises at the expense of the American public.

Commercial dog walking will require additional annual expenditures for administering and overseeing a permitting process, additional law enforcement, additional resource maintenance and additional public relations.

The DEIS estimates that over 1000 dogs will be commercially walked within the GGNRA daily (p. 63 p. 276). Commercial dog walkers, with up to six dogs, will negatively impact the experience of park visitors on trails and in other areas of the park. If permitted, commercial dog walking activity will increase within the GGNRA and will displace park visitors, of all legitimate user groups, from areas of the park. Commercial dog walkers will dominate the ROLAs, displacing other park visitors. Commercial dog walking vehicles will occupy parking spaces resulting in fewer spaces available for park visitors. If allowed, commercial dog walking operations will have a dominant presence in some areas of the park thus affecting the overall character and ambiance of those areas.

Currently, commercial dog walking is not permitted within the GGNRA or any other National Park unit and there is no justifiable reason to do so. The NPS is well within the scope of its management directives to not allow commercial dog walking and I support this position.

Corr. ID: 2919

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203318

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please keep private businesses out of our National Parks by excluding Commercial Dog Walkers from using the GGNRA for business purposes. The large presence of dogs in areas like Fort Funston excluded others from equally using the space and private commercial benefit is not the purpose of the National Park System.

Corr. ID: 3059

Organization: Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Comment ID: 201235

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: No commercial dog walking should be allowed inside the National Parks. If an individual owns more than 3 dogs, then s/he should be granted a special permit to walk them all at once. This opportunity should not be extended to for-profit individuals.

Corr. ID: 3584

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203658

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I read the following letter to the editor in the San Francisco Chronicle on Thursday, May 12, 2011, and feel it perfectly reflects my feelings on the dog leash issue in the Golden Gate National Parks.

Please protect our precious San Francisco ecology by requiring dogs in the park to be on leash and by limiting the number of dogs a single person can bring into the park.

Thank you.

-- "Leash commercial dog-walkers"

Commercial dog walkers are abusing our parks.

As a frequent visitor to the Presidio, I encounter many groups of eight to 12 off-leash dogs in all areas of the park.

Although I love dogs, it does not seem fair or appropriate for commercial operators to allow their paid-for charges to run rampant in public parks where they threaten native wildlife and plants, as well as adults and children.

At the very least, these commercial operators should be limited to four on-leash dogs (the maximum one person can truly manage) in specific areas of the park.

They should be held accountable for infringements of park policies and, as other park vendors do, should have to purchase a license to operate in the park.

These funds could be used to enforce the regulations and maintain the dog-access areas.

Corr. ID: 4322

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209452

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Having watched vanloads of dogs unloaded onto park property, I support whatever means GGNRA needs to control them. To site one location, Baker Beach, I have personally watched vanload after vanload of dogs arrive as paid dog drivers open up their vans and allow unleashed dogs to run onto the beach without any controls. They are not so-called dog "walkers", they are dog drivers - they drive dogs to parks and dump them there.

Corr. ID: 4421

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207307

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If the Park does allow professional dog walkers in the Park with up to 3 dogs (and I do not wish in any way for this to occur), the dog walker should be required to meet the following criteria:

- a. wear visibly, a current SF business license, in bold print, enabling them to walk dogs.
- b. Place a placard in bold print in their vehicle window, facing out, showing a current SF business license, enabling them to walk dogs
- c. Carry proof of current SF dog license and rabies inoculation for each dog walked and show to park law enforcement on demand
- d. Be allowed to walk only those dogs who have been trained to voice, whistle or hand command and be able to demonstrate this behavior to park law enforcement on demand.
- e. Not be allowed to walk specified, notoriously aggressive or hunting breeds.
- f. Require a performance bond to be on file with the Park which will be used to defray all expenses suffered by the park by malfeasance, accidents, and rule infractions by the professional dog walker.
- g. The Park will provide a hotline/response team for the public to report infractions.
- h. The Park will provide the proper level of enforcement to achieve their agreed to rules and goals

Corr. ID: 4665

Organization: National Parks Conservation Association

Comment ID: 209157

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The NPS should not permit commercial dog-walking as such a use does not appear to be permissible under law and policy guidelines. Additionally,

commercial dog walking (with each walker having up to six dogs) will negatively impact park resources and visitors, will not provide public service or benefit to visitors, and is contrary to guidelines on private, commercial use of national parks.

Concern ID: 30466

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that professional dog walkers should have a license/permit/fee/certification/identification and/or be regulated for walking dogs at GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 5 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181405 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Lastly, please consider stricter regulation, licensing and fees for dog walkers vs. single or 2 dog owners. One idea might be that during the weeks, when dog walkers are more active the rules are different than on weekends when owners are more likely to be out.

Corr. ID: 321 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181079 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree with the fact that as professionals we need to be licensed and regulated. Although I think that 8 off leash dog per licensed professional is a little more reasonable, I am comfortable with the 6 dog limit. I feel it is imperative that we be able to use Fort Funston in the way that we are now. It is a huge open space and that makes it more manageable and safe for walking a pack of dogs. Why can't we as professionals pay a fee to use the park? That way the funds can be used to maintain the trails better, etc.

Corr. ID: 1504 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191393 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Suggestions

- 1) Professional dog walkers should be licensed and pay a use fee as other vendors do
- 2) There should be a limit on the number of such licenses based on the "carrying capacity"
- 3) Professional dog walkers should be limited to a maximum of 4 dogs and all on leash. One person cannot manage properly more than 4 dogs at a time..
- 4) Professional dog walkers who do not respect the policy should not be allowed to use the parks.
- 5) Post signs so that users cannot claim they do not know the regulations.
- 6) Authorize and encourage all staff to enforce the policy
- 7) Consider authorizing park volunteers from existing programs to help in policy enforcement.
- 8) Consider establishing a fenced "dog run area" where dogs could run free. (perhaps also a use schedule for professional dog walkers).
- 9) Promote better understanding of the need for a Dog Management Plan and the restoration activities through signs and fliers distributed in the park and nearby neighborhoods.

Hopefully, implementation of a clear policy will eliminate the many abuses that have occurred and make the park pleasant and safe for all users as well as for the native habitat.

Corr. ID: 2044 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193285 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree that commercial dog walkers have a permit to walk their dogs, and use the money to maintain the parks.

Corr. ID: 4408 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206413 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One way to control commercial dog walkers at Fort Funston

would be to designate a small number of parking places for them in the parking lot, parking places with an hour time limit. Their vehicles should have an identifying bumper sticker that can be checked against their license plate and the dog walkers themselves could wear an ID tag. Once again I do not feel that they belong there, but if they are to be there and have dogs off-leash, they should do so in a fenced area. Landscaping with natives could help to disguise the fence. Enforcement would be easier and dogs would not be lost. Commercial dog walkers do lose dogs. The majority of people who come to the GGNRA without dogs could then have a dog-free experience in a national park.

Concern ID: 30467

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters acknowledge that professional dog walkers are bringing more dogs than they can control to GGNRA and/or these dogs negatively affect visitors or the park through impacts to park resources or through dog waste.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 215 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180674 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I do acknowledge and agree that there are people that abuse the GGNP's dog friendly policies. Namely, the "professional dog walkers" that bring 7-10 dogs to the park at a time in their small trucks several times a day. There is no way that one person can control that many dogs off the leash or even on sometimes. It is also these dog walkers that do not pick up their dogs waste.

Corr. ID: 2308 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200626 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: At Fort Funston and lower Ocean Beach I have seen solitary (professional, I presume) dog-walkers with 14-15 dogs off-leash. Usually the number is over ten dogs per dog-walker. They cannot control all those dogs and they don't watch them closely enough to pick up their feces. Many dog owners feel their dog's poop is "part of nature" so it's okay to leave it on the beach.

Corr. ID: 2314 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195287 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 4. Professional dog walkers, with their large packs of dogs, are something of a plague already in parts of GGNRA. They dominate certain trails in the Presidio, for example, which is not necessarily a bad thing for people who like dogs, but can be unpleasant and even intimidating for non-dog people, or even those who do enjoy dogs in small numbers. The large packs of dogs also have a particularly strong negative impact on wildlife.

Corr. ID: 3608 **Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon

Comment ID: 203970 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 5. In areas where dogs are allowed, there should be a maximum of three per person. I regularly observe multiple groups of commercial dog walkers with 10 or 12 up to 15 dogs. Voice and sight control of this many dogs is not possible. With this large number of dogs the dog walker picks up feces from one dog and misses the fact that other dogs are chasing wildlife or defecating. Feces are left in GGNRA lands where it has a negative impact on park users, wildlife, and water quality.

See EPA defined dog waste as a non-point source of pollution

<http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/nps/whatudo.cfm> and

http://www.epa.gov/owow_keep/NPS/toolbox/print/psatpet.pdf

http://www.epa.gov/owow_keep/NPS/toolbox/other/KSMO_PetWaste.pdf

The San Francisco Public Utilities Company on dog waste and water

http://sfwater.org/detail.cfm/MC_ID/14/MS_ID/118/C_ID/3426

6. Some trails in the GGNRA in San Francisco should be no dogs allowed. Under the current plan, nearly every trail in San Francisco is open to on-leash dogs, thus there are no trails for people who prefer to enjoy the outdoors without interacting with

domestic pets. I recommend that the Coastal Bluff Trails be no dogs allowed.

Corr. ID: 3994

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207459

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats and also on people. For example, I would love to take advantage of the walks offered by the "Y" in the Presidio, but cannot because of all the dogs off leash. Dog walkers take 4 or 5 dogs on these paths and let them run wild. It is terrifying because the dogs turn into packs and can be very dangerous.

I can never go to the beach either because of all the dogs off leash. Again the dog walkers are a big problem here. I have seen some dog walkers that don't even know the names of the dogs to call them off.

It seems so unfair that as a tax paying San Franciscan, I cannot enjoy some of the beautiful outdoor spaces that the city has because of all the off leash dogs. There needs to be more stringent regulations. And most importantly, they need to be enforced.

Corr. ID: 4282

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209051

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We also hope the ultimate plan will address what Edward Abbey might have called "industrial dog walkers". On volunteer habitat restoration work in the Presidio we sometimes encounter people with 10 or more pooches in tow. Not only are that many dogs in a group intimidating to those who fear dogs, such treatment is unfair and maybe not humane for the dogs themselves. And one can only wonder how dog walkers of large groups deal with dog feces and urine. Packs of dogs must also be unsettling to wildlife, even if leashed.

Concern ID:

30468

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters suggests that professional dog walkers should be limited by the number of dogs (which ranges from 3 -8 dogs) they bring to GGNRA.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 417

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181596

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: On another note, I would like to commend the proposal for limiting 3 dogs per person (6 with a permit). As a dog owner, I've at times been annoyed with commercial dog walkers who have more dogs than they control.

Corr. ID: 1052

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192136

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There should be a limit of 3 dogs per person. It is not appropriate for the Park Service to create commercial permits for professional dog walkers. Also, it is unlikely that most visitors with dogs will be able to keep control of more than 3 dogs at one time.

Professional pet service activities should be done in places with guidelines in place for this kind of work. A public park should be a safe space for people first, not one dominated by professional service activities.

Corr. ID: 1561

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190763

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Allow people who walk their own dogs to have the freedom they currently have but place restrictions on the "Professional dog walkers" i.e numbers of dogs they can walk at one time together and where

Corr. ID: 2034

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193268

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Professional dog walkers should be limited in number/maximum of 4 dogs - and should pay a fee as other vendors do. Uncontrolled dogs are a threat to native plants as well as children who use the parks.

Corr. ID: 2888

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202946

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 7. Per dogs off-leash numbers and access:

a. Please put an 8 dog total limit for dog-walkers into effect. I also support 6 dogs off leash max for two reasons. First, is the poop pick-up factor. It is so easy, and I also see it almost daily, to miss some poop with more than 6 dogs off leash. secondly is the transportation factor. I see far to many pick-up trucks jammed full of precious pooches. This is one of the personal preference and responsibility angles vs, profit potential that many dog-walkers are unabashed about when they sacrifice safety for dollars. Limiting the max-number of dogs will at fist deeply disappoint and possibly infuriate some singular dog-walkers and dog-walking companies, but the larger benefit of safety, park flow, and management will create a more cohesive community where everyone understands expectations and decorum.

Corr. ID: 3165

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203948

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As long as I can remember, GGNRA has not allowed any type of commercial business on the property at Fort Funston. There was someone who wanted to set up a coffee/snack truck and was told that it was not allowed-no commercial businesses on GGNRA property. Why then do you allow professional dog walkers to conduct their business at Fort Funston? These people do NOT pay taxes on a large part of their income (as most goes unclaimed due to cash payments). Most of them are not licensed businesses. They walk too many dogs simultaneously. Many dog parks in the south bay limit the number of dogs one person can bring to the park to three(3). Three is the number of dogs a household may have without a kennel license.

A couple of dogs running down a hillside do not cause much disruption to the environment. A person with a pack of 10 to 15 dogs does.

Instead of limiting off-leash access to dog owners, limit the number of dogs any one person may bring at a time.

Concern ID: 30470

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Some commenters are under the impression that that DEIS will ban commercial dog walking at GGNRA and they are against this ban.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 629

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181318

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please allow dog walkers to continue doing their jobs, walking up to 8 dogs at a time, on leash. The idea of banning commercial dog walking is completely devastating to me.

Corr. ID: 3197

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203953

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a San Francisco resident of over 50 years. You may have guessed that I am also a senior citizen. You may not have guessed that I am a professional dog walker. My small business means everything to me...it brings me great joy, and enables me to live in this very expensive city. My business is registered and I pay taxes. I handle my dogs responsibly, which involves picking up after them and making sure we do not intrude on other park visitors. I take my dogs to Fort Funston, Crissy Field and occasionally Ocean Beach (where dogs are allowed off leash). Often when I'm caring for these dogs I pick up litter. Most of the litter is left by people. Because of my very small business, I am able to live...I also greatly improve the lives of my clients who could not be dog owners in this city, were it not for me. I have seen others in my profession act irresponsibly and I want to be clear

that I do not approve of their behavior. Since it is the wrong-doers who are causing the issues in the first place, why not punish them rather than the rest of us? I deserve the right to conduct my business.

Corr. ID: 3653

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204152

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a professional dog walker in Mill Valley, CA. I often use several of the trails that are under review for changes in dog walking. I have to say that I am daily befuddled at the thought of what I do becoming illegal. Being a professional, I take great pride in the manners that I require of the dogs in my packs, NOT allowing them to pile out of the truck, but leashing each and every one until we are well onto the trail, and then releasing only those who are trustworthy and well trained enough to be polite trail users. Knowing that this is not always going to be the case, I avoid, avoid, avoid whenever possible, and bait my ever hungry canine companions towards me with treats, if necessary, to ensure that their attention is on ME, and not anyone else passing by. We've received many compliments over the years about how it can be done WELL. I provide a very valuable service to my community, and plead with you to not take away the privilege of hiking these precious family pets in Natural places where they can romp and play and spin out their beans so that they can stay happy, healthy and fit, which makes them better citizens all around. As a private individual with three of my own dogs, my heart wrenches at the thought of never being able to go to Muir Beach again. I've lived in Marin for 25 years BECAUSE of the Natural beauty of this place. The restrictions coming down feel as though we are being choked right out of the county. As far as degradation of the parks via feces and off trail galavanting, there will always be individuals who scoff at their responsibility, but they are the minority. And I would bet that no matter what restrictions come to pass that those same individuals will continue to violate the laws. The VAST majority of us LOVE our parks, and show it by cleaning up after our precious pets, as we do not like to step in poo anymore than anyone else. In fact, my own personal and professional policy is to pick it up if I see it, whether it came from the dogs in my care, or not. If this precious privilege is taken away, not only will my own dogs and I suffer for it, but my business, as well.

Concern ID: 30471

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Some commenters believe that the commercial dog walking business will be economically affected by the DEIS (through limiting the number of dogs allowed) and/or this will be passed down as a higher cost to the client.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 530

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182401

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I also know many people who make their living walking dogs at Fort Funston. Requiring them to keep their dogs on-leash could potentially put them out of work or at the very least, dramatically reduce their income due the fewer number of dogs they could walk.

Corr. ID: 586

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 182111

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I work full-time during the week and my dog enjoys a long dog walk with a group of 8-10 other dogs led by a passionate dog walker whose business would be jeopardized by the plan due to restrictions on the number of dogs he can have out with him as well as having a limited area to play (they currently go to Fort Funston every day to play).

Corr. ID: 2008

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 193215

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Dog walkers typically charge between \$15-25 per dog perday. If dog walkers are limited to only "6" dogs, the price to have a dog walked will have to jump up to \$45-70/ dog-day. Is this fair for dog owners who pay to have

their dogs walked while they are at work?

Corr. ID: 2854

Organization: San Jose State University

Comment ID: 202652

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 3. The plan is quite dismissive of the impact on small business, the professional dogwalkers, and a separate cost-benefit analysis must be conducted in this regard (see p. 24 of Chapter 1, (72/269)). They dismiss this socioeconomic impact since "Estimated total spending by all local visitors to GGNRA accounts for 0.0008 percent of total GDP for the San Francisco MSA" Of course, any specific group of small business will account for a small proportion of the regional GDP. In terms of the number of jobs, this could be quite high.

Concern ID:

30472

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

It has been suggested that the commercial dog walking rules at GGNRA be the same as the County and City regulations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3166

Organization: Presidio Resident/SF Pro Dog

Comment ID: 203839

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. It is not based in fact; instead, it relies on speculations, exaggerations, and misleading statements. It reaches conclusions that are not supported by either the science or the law.

The Park Service should revise the dog management plan to:

Honor the original 1979 Pet Policy. Respect dog-walking as legitimate recreation.

Provide for extensive off and on-leash dog walking on all trails and other lands acquired by the GGNRA since 1979, especially in San Mateo County. 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.). Align commercial dog walking rules with county or city regulations. In addition, the plan to permit dog walkers to six dogs is ridiculous. I've been a professional dog walker for over five years and I don't know anyone that can't control six dogs on leash. The limit, if any, should be eight. This way you are not capping our income and you are not forcing us to increase our prices beyond the means of most of our clients. Require people to get a business license with the city, be insured with any of the major pet insurance companies and hold a permit. This will help get rid of some of the walkers who don't take this job seriously. And to be honest, it's more of the individual owners that are the ones causing problems: not leashing their dogs, leaving feces on the trails, etc. I've heard this from multiple Park Police officers.

Corr. ID: 3494

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203373

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe the GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation, as it has done for many years. It was designed as an urban recreation area, not a pristine wilderness area. I wish there were more of these in the state, but the Bay Area urban environment and the GGNRA is not the place to try and do this without comprehensive reform of all laws and norms regarding lifestyle, economics, etc.

I urge you to consider revising your dog management plan to:

? Provide for extensive off and on-leash dog walking on all trails and other lands acquired by the GGNRA since 1979, especially in San Mateo County, where more not fewer off leash and dog friendly areas are desperately needed

? Honor the original 1979 Pet Policy and respect dog-walking as legitimate recreation and need.

? 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.).

? Eliminate "compliance-based management," which will allow additional restrictions to be implemented without any public input.

? Enable professional dog walking and align any professional dog walking rules with county or city regulations.

Thank you, and I hope you will take these comments into consideration.

Concern ID: 30473

CONCERN STATEMENT: It has been suggested that time usage limitations be placed on commercial dog walkers at GGNRA (such as only 3 dogs during the summer and 6 dogs at other times).

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3095 **Organization:** Self
Comment ID: 203092 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: (4) limitations for professional dog walkers that are more restrictive during high use periods (summer day times) and less restricted at other times (early mornings, rainy days, winter weekdays, etc.) -- for example allowing only 3 dogs per professional during summer days and 6 dogs per professional at other times (with appropriate permits).

Concern ID: 30474

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commercial dog walkers are complaining that they cannot control their dogs on-leash on trails so the trails should be off-leash for the dog walkers safety.

For representative quotes, please see Concer 29623 (VR2010), Comment 203250

Concern ID: 30475

CONCERN STATEMENT: It has been suggested that commercial dog walkers should have their dogs on-leash at GGNRA.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29679 (AL5000), Comment 203845.

Concern ID: 30476

CONCERN STATEMENT: It has been stated that commercial dog walkers are responsible and clean up after their dogs and/or do not pose a problem in or to the park.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3660 **Organization:** Doggy Rules Kitty Rules
Comment ID: 204588 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I am a dog walker and I take my dogs to many of the parks in the GGNRA. But I only take one or two dogs at a time. Every dog walker that I see out there is responsible, picking up poop and taking care that their dogs are behaving. In fact, I believe that dog walkers and other animal professionals are the most caring and responsible people out there. I believe that it is random, rogue dog owners who do not train their pets and are most likely also not responsible in picking up their pet's waste or curbing their pet's possible bad behavior.

I don't believe it is the "right thing to do", putting many, many people out of work or in desperate circumstances for their livelihood. Not to mention all of the people (from all over the Bay Area, tourists, etc) and their pets who count on these areas to be open to them and their pets every day.

Why do a handful of irresponsible people have the power to ruin something wonderful many, many responsible, caring people depend on and love? There has to be a better way.

Corr. ID: 3973

Organization: Prodog

Comment ID: 206220

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The professional dog walkers seem to be the only ones aware of the rules, like staying out of the dunes, lagoon and off the main trail while offleash.

I routinely encounter civilians letting their dogs dig for gophers and chase the protected wildlife.

Corr. ID: 3977

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207168

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I primarily use the Alta trail head from Donahue Street in Marin City to walk my two pugs off-leash. I have seen hundreds of dogs which also use this section of the fire road over the 16+ years that I have been a resident here. I have never witnessed anything which might be considered harmful to this environment as it relates to pets and their owners being allowed to exercise untethered. Several dog walkers depend on using this section of the trail for exercising the dogs of their clients. All of them have either kept their dogs on a leash or under good voice control whenever I have come across them.

Please keep This section of the fire road available for off leash use.

Concern ID:

30477

CONCERN STATEMENT:

[It has been suggested that a group be created of commercial dog walkers and the government to regulate off-leash dog walking and protect the environment.](#)

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 3895

Organization: ProDOG

Comment ID: 206416

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I agree with the DEIS in that dog walkers should be regulated within the GGNRA. But the compliance based management strategy put forth in this document is the wrong way to do it. Dog walking is one of the fastest growing service industries in the country. It should be regulated and assisted by the Federal Government. In these tough economic times, the government has a duty to help maintain and grow any emerging industries to increase employment. The GGNRA and professional dog walkers should be working hand-in-hand to grow the industry, increase jobs, and create a sense of trust between our industry and the government. We should be on the same team.

Therefore, I propose the creation of a Canine Stewardship Core(CSC) to work with the GGNRA Conservancy to regulate off leash dog walking AND protect and beautify the GGNRA. Whatever damage off-leash dog walking allegedly creates within the GGNRA, surely it can be off set by intelligent projects to restore other areas within the GGNRA. I'm proposing free labor from hoards of dog lovers in exchange for access to the historically off leash areas within the GGNRA. Each side need to compromise and bring something to the table and build a relationship for the future based on trust and mutual respect.

Concern ID:

30478

CONCERN

[The DEIS will cause more commercial dog walkers to use the park, thus affecting the](#)

STATEMENT: character and overall ambience of those areas.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4584

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210017

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS estimates that over 1000 dogs will be commercially walked within the GGNRA daily (p. 63 p. 276). Commercial dog walkers, with up to six dogs, will negatively impact the experience of park visitors on trails and in other areas of the park. If permitted, commercial dog walking activity will increase within the GGNRA and will displace park visitors, of all legitimate user groups, from areas of the park. Commercial dog walkers will dominate the ROLAs, displacing other park visitors. Commercial dog walking vehicles will occupy parking spaces resulting in fewer spaces available for park visitors. If allowed, commercial dog walking operations will have a dominant presence in some areas of the park thus affecting the overall character and ambience of those areas.

Concern ID: 30479

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters have suggested that commercial dog walkers should schedule their use at the park or have a finite number of parking spaces for commercial dog walkers so these businesses will be spread out at the park sites - could use a smartphone application and have a cap for commercial dog walking parking spaces at each site.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4408

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206412

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These dog walking businesses could also be scheduled to use the facilities that have been created for dogs in San Francisco. If we can have smart phone applications for parking places in San Francisco, we can also reserve spots for commercial dog walkers in dog spaces in San Francisco in some equitable fashion, using the web, and distribute them so they do not all crowd into one space. They would have many choices.

VU5000 - Visitor Use and Experience: Cumulative Impacts

Concern ID: 30463

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The proposed alternative will have cumulative impacts on dog owners, particularly at Fort Funston.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4622

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207095

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Visitor Use & Experience -

The DEIS does not have data to support conclusions of "preferred alternative". This "preferred alternative" will result in major adverse cumulative impacts for myself and many other users of Fort Funston. In that NPS has not performed a site survey at Fort Funston, it is amazing that the DEIS can support the "preferred alternative" when the user population has never been surveyed.

WH2010 - Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Affected Environment

Concern ID: 30481

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Dogs chase wildlife in the GGNRA, including shorebirds and rabbits. Dogs also harass marine mammals. Dogs also dig into burrows, tear up vegetation important to species, and affect the smells of the park for wildlife. Even if the dogs do not catch the wildlife, they cause wildlife stress, which can lead to less breeding, smaller fat reserves, and other impacts that can lessen survival.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1681

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200231 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: These are the reasons I believe dog owners need to be accountable for their dogs, and why dogs need to be leashed at Rodeo Beach: Dogs run right into the lagoon, disturbing and scaring away wildlife - ducks, cormorants, gulls, pelicans, etc. I have even seen people chase their dogs into the lagoon. This really upsets me.

- Dogs run off trail, and onto the plants on the sand dunes, probably stepping on the nests and eggs of wildlife. I don't want to see the majestic Killdeer disappear because its young are being trampled by dogs.

Corr. ID: 2939 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202400 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: PLEASE STRENGTHEN ALL RULES CONTROLLING DOG BEHAVIOR AT OCEAN BEACH!!! THEY ARE A CONSTANT HAZARD FOR THE BIRDS ATTEMPTING TO FEED AND REST. I AM A DAILY WITNESS AT OCEAN BEACH!

I have lived in the Richmond District in San Francisco since 1960, moving here as a child. I have always been an active user of our beautiful parks and now live five blocks from Ocean Beach. Since we moved here four years ago, to this location near the beach, my husband and I walk daily on or near the Ocean Beach. Frankly, I have been appalled at the overwhelming presence of off-leash dogs and the immense damage that they bring to the bird life. I love watching the birds at the seashore, and yet, these birds almost never get a chance to rest or eat undisturbed. It is so very sad that people are indifferent or completely heedless of the damage that their dogs cause. Just today, while walking, every dog we saw was chasing the birds full time, and in our 45 minute walk we saw absolutely no shoreline birds feeding, the few that we did see were constantly fleeing the dog attacks. (Our walk started at Judah Street and included a large area of on-leash dog territory. The dogs were all unleashed!)

I have learned not to speak with the dog walkers as they are completely unreasonable, often very nasty, if you point out the negative effects on the birds. I really love dogs and birds too, but they simply do not mix at all. I know quite a bit about birds, and their presence to me in their natural habitat at the beach is an extremely important part of my health and well-being...not to mention their ability to use the beach being essential to their health and well-being.

ABOVE ALL, DO NOT BELIEVE THE COMPLETE LIES THAT DOG PEOPLE PROMOTE; i.e. THE LIES THAT ONLY A FEW DOGS CHASE THE BIRDS!!! ALMOST ALL OF THE DOGS AT OCEAN BEACH CHASE BIRDS, UNLESS ON A LEASH!!!

Corr. ID: 3665 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203515 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Keep dogs out of GGNRA trails! I have been bitten and snapped at by dogs off their leash many times at Mori Point, and I'm just plain tired of it. Not to mention stepping in the dog poop, and seeing the wildlife scared away by dogs charging into the bushes. Yes, I'm tired of it. No dogs at all. I would support a leash-only rule, but dog owners completely ignore such rules where we have them now (e.g., Linda Mar beach). Dog owners should have their own dog parks, where they can play dodge the doo-doo and hope that dog charging at you is friendly

Corr. ID: 4024 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 207012 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have witnessed dogs burrowing deep holes behind restricted, fenced areas, run freely in the snowy plover habitat during nesting

season, chase seabirds fishing close to shore, as well as audibly disturb the landscape, which may drive wild animals from their habitats. Many dog walkers either do not care about those around them, or cannot control their charges, particularly when they take many canines out at once

Corr. ID: 4683

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210190

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: California Quail, jackrabbits and brush rabbits were once common at Fort Funston. Prior to that area being taken by dog owners, they successfully bred there. I recall watching 2 particular visitors encouraging their dogs to chase the rabbits. Both told me the dogs never caught a rabbit and I have no reason not to believe them. What they and many others apparently did do is chase the rabbits and the ground dwelling quail to the point they could no longer successfully breed. The stressful impacts of 2 dogs probably wouldn't do much, but the stress from tens or even hundreds of dogs on a small population certainly would. Those animals no longer inhabit Fort Funston and for that matter the rest of GGNRA in San Francisco. Since all three species survived the period Fort Funston was an active military base and the period it was vacated and a little used parkland, it seems their demise can most likely be attributed to the onslaught of dogs that destroyed their habitat. That in itself should be reason to ban dogs, or at least require leashed access to paved trails only.

Concern ID:

30482

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Dogs scare away wildlife by chasing, barking, and even their scent, which alerts prey to a predator in the area. Dogs can find wildlife humans cannot see or smell, and their scent can deter wildlife from occupying an area. Many people who seek out wildlife watching opportunities have found that the presence of dogs significantly detracts from this experience. Many commenters noted that owners were either oblivious or actively ignoring the rules about wildlife.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1065

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192185

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I frequently visit the GGNRA lands and I strongly recommend more stringent control of dog access to GGNRA lands. I have witnessed dogs harassing wildlife, including listed species such as the Snowy Plover. I have also experienced loose dogs running up and jumping on my leashed dog when I am trying to take a quiet walk through the park. I have also seen dogs digging and destroying vegetation off trail and in some locations I have seen large amounts of dog feces which are not cleaned up.

I love dogs and think they should have space to run and interact with other dogs. But wildlife and wild areas must be protected or the GGNRA lands that are so popular will decline in beauty and species diversity. I think dogs should have specific areas where they are allowed off leash and other areas where dogs on leash only are allowed. I also strongly support restricting dogs from any areas where listed species are present (whether resident or migratory). Dogs should not be allowed to harass wildlife or to destroy habitat, this includes flushing birds.

Dogs are predators that can directly and negatively impact species and even a leashed dog can discourage species. Birds tend to flush with greater frequency even near leashed, well behaved dogs.

Corr. ID: 1572

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190780

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: #1) Most sad are dogs chasing wildlife, I have heard that when animals smell dogs they may abandon their nests. Dogs disturbing wild creatures is my biggest concern. I have seen dogs at Stinson Beach chase shorebirds

until they cannot fly. Their owners just think it is sport.

Corr. ID: 2240 **Organization:** California Native Plant Society

Comment ID: 200886 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Although I admire and appreciate dogs as pets, I believe most people who seriously consider the issue would agree that dogs do not belong everywhere. Of course dogs enjoy running, but in the GGNRA unsupervised dogs take a toll on native bird, wildlife, and plant populations through harassment, flushing, and soil disturbances as well as direct killing.

Corr. ID: 3894 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206182 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'd like to strongly suggest that Muir Beach and the mountains south of Muir Beach towards Tennessee Valley and onto Rodeo beach all be a 100% NO DOG Zone.

The last three times I've been there I have seen multiple rabbits, 1 coyote, and 1 bob cat - and some one was with me for a witness.

I know from the research that people who hike with dogs will see less birds, bc the dogs run ahead and directly or more likely indirectly scare them away.

I think Muir beach and the mtns south to rodeo beach should allow wildlife to roam free with out the fear of being chased or harassed by dogs.

I also WANT to see these animals. Dogs in this area would decrease my enjoyment by scaring the animals away.

Corr. ID: 4215 **Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Comment ID: 208890 **Organization Type:** Conservation/Preservation

Representative Quote: We were unable to find an analysis of one probable effect of dog activity on mammalian wildlife, either on or off-leash. Most mammals use the production of certain chemicals and their sense of smell to communicate substantial amounts of information. One well known way that canids, whether domestic or wild, communicate is through chemical secretions in urine. The awareness of scent marking in urination is not limited to other members of the genus *Canis*, but is clearly perceived by other mammals as well, be they potential prey like rabbits or other carnivores such as a bobcat. The daily presence (and urination by) tens to hundreds of domestic dogs in areas of natural habitat create a profound stressor on other native mammals, and should be noted in the environmental analysis. An unfortunate brush rabbit finding itself at Fort Funston would "believe" that it had landed in the wolf pack to end all wolf packs.

Corr. ID: 4250 **Organization:** SPAWN, EAC, PRNSA, Audubon, CNPS, Lepidopterists Society, Sierra Club, Trees Foundation, Nature in

Comment ID: 209206 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Therefore those who wish to observe wild animals, along with the animals themselves, need to be spared the presence of dogs, who, whether on a leash or not, will be perceived as predators, especially if they derive from hunting breeds.

Because pet dogs are deliberately prevented from full maturity, and obtain food, rest, and comfort with little if any effort on their part, they enjoy surplus energies unknown to wildlife, -- to whom interruptions of critically needed rest, awareness, and/or activities (also immune systems) represent costly perhaps fatal danger, and cause alienating experience on what should be home ground. Those disturbances and disruptions translate to deprivation for those who wish to engage in nature study, the one visitor activity that should never be denied. I can enumerate many

attacks by dogs on wildlife that I or friends have witnessed; I and others I know have ourselves been chased or attacked by dogs; and for everyone of my acquaintance who visits parks, including dog owners themselves, both dog-droppings and the means to dispose of them, have become as customary as they are unwelcome sights -- or worse. Almost as ubiquitous: pet-owners, whether friendly, furtive, flagrant, or hostile, who violate posted regulations

Corr. ID: 4265 **Organization:** Kellner and Associates

Comment ID: 209115 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have a concern regarding the effect of dogs and people on the behavior of wildlife and use by wildlife of lands of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Because of a dog's acute sense of hearing and smell, they are able to search for and encounter wildlife that would ordinarily escape detection by humans. In addition, I have observed many times during my recreational use of open space lands, dogs flushing and otherwise disrupting wildlife behavior. The owners of the dogs are either oblivious or encourage such behavior. Off leash dogs are particularly destructive because they chase wildlife.

In addition to the direct displacement of wildlife, the odor of a dog can deter wildlife from using a particular area thereby reducing the size of the GGNRA available for use by wildlife. Barriers to wildlife movement, by either the physical presence of dogs or the odor of dogs, are particularly detrimental when they they reduce the movement of wildlife from one area to another.

Concern ID:

30483

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Even when dogs chase birds and other wildlife, they rarely, if ever, catch them. Some visitors felt that it was satisfying to watch the dogs playing with the birds on the beach, while others noted that dog owners were quick to stop the behavior if their dog was chasing birds.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1699 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191116 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Walking every day for 10 years at Mori Point, Montara, and/or Moss Beach, Cliffs at 20 miles per week, I have never had an incident with dogs or birds.

Birders do hate dogs, usually. I however do not hate dogs. I enjoy the noises birds make when they always easily get away from dogs chasing them.

Seems as though we can all get along without new laws, etc.

Corr. ID: 4115 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208499 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We talked about ground-nesting birds, yet raccoons, coyotes, and humans are just as dangerous-more so for the first two-to the birds. All of the animals poop; only the dogs' are picked up and removed. The birds don't appear to be scared of or by 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, frankly.

Corr. ID: 4267 **Organization:** Law Office of David Elliott Wise

Comment ID: 209102 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Last year I saw an off leash terrier sneak up on a tern standing at the surf line, near Sloat Blvd. at Ocean Beach. The terrier grabbed the Tern, shook it hard a few times, while the owner watched and ineffectually tried to call the dog off. After several shakes, it dropped the Tern. The bird's wing appeared to be broken, it could not fly, but limped to the water, dragging the broken wing, and then floated about in the surf. I called the Park Police, and about forty five

minutes later a Park officer drove by, looking out the window, and kept going.

Corr. ID: 4548

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209814

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: During our walks we have seen many dogs chase birds. The birds, in all honesty, seem to be playing with the dogs. I have never see a dog catch a bird. We did see a bird caught in a tree and reported it using the yellow phone in the parking lot. We also seen dogs digging to try and get gophers but we've also seen people grab them and pull them away.

Concern ID:

30484

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The statement that dogs affect wildlife is unfounded. This assertion should be proven with site-specific examples in the EIS. The impacts of dogs need to be compared to the impacts of other user groups. The examples given of incidents with dogs and wildlife do not show a large impact, particularly when compared to other factors.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 2911

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202487

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: ?There is no scientific consensus that severe restrictions on off-leash dogs are needed to protect natural resources and wildlife. Some of the most compelling research in the last few years has been by researchers such as Forrest and Cassidy St. Clair (2006) and Warren (2007) who admit that they expected to find that off-leash dogs had a major impact on the diversity, abundance, and feeding behaviors of birds and small mammals. However, when they did the actual research, they found no such impacts. This indicates that assumptions about impacts from off-leash dogs must be tested and proven to be true before they can be used to justify restrictions. Unfortunately, most of the assumptions cited by the GGNRA have not been adequately tested or proven. In addition, the GGNRA has repeatedly cited research that they claim shows major impacts from off-leash dogs. However, when the raw data from these studies is analyzed, it is clear the claimed conclusions are not supported by the data. This is highly reminiscent of the problems documented at the Point Reyes National Seashore, where claims by staff biologists about negative impacts from an oyster farm located within the park were proven to be baseless when the raw data was independently analyzed.

Corr. ID: 3130

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202029

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS is full of impacts of dogs on wildlife and other park visitors that "could" occur, but there is little evidence that these impacts actually do occur. After over ten years of intensive scrutiny of off-leash dogs in the GGNRA, it should be obvious if those impacts really do occur. The lack of data indicates they do not. For example, the DEIS mentions that disease "could" be transmitted to people from unpicked-up dog feces. However there has not been a single case of dog-feces-caused human illness reported by the San Francisco Department of Health for over 50 years. A management policy should not be based on hypothetical impacts.

Corr. ID: 3777

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205134

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS 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 DEIS needs to test the hypothesis that off-leash dogs are harmful to these sites before it can justify further restrictions.

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.

Corr. ID: 4015 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 206825 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: 3) Your proposal seems to place all of the responsibility for impact to wildlife on un-leashed dogs without comprehensive, un-biased studies which point to this conclusion. I am not a scientist, but I do operate in a world where data are included as part of the decision-making process. The few reports you did include point to human impact (snowy plover at crissy field, for example) as having the highest disturbance rate, yet I see nothing in the plan which is aimed at restricting walkers, runners, messy picnickers (whose trash we pick up when walking our dogs) cyclists, skaters?

Corr. ID: 4575 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209971 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Your own data showed that of 5,700 dogs observed, only 29 deliberately chased birds. That only 1/2 of one percent! That percentage would be a lot higher for the hawks and ravens, which actually kill prey.

Corr. ID: 4686 **Organization:** The Marin Humane Society

Comment ID: 227782 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: The draft plan refers to dog-related viruses that can be transmitted through dog feces to marine and terrestrial mammals. The disease examples listed in the draft plan are extremely rare and in fact the diseases spread are even more unlikely without direct physical contact from the infected species. Since the Marin GGNRA lands support a very healthy population of host wildlife species_ the same dangers could also apply to protecting visitor's dogs from disease issues and public safety issues around wildlife (as well as people). We are not aware of any wildlife disease issues in Marin County that have been spread to wildlife from dogs and we would debate this finding.

Concern ID: 30485

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

If dogs were prohibited from some areas, it would give wildlife, particularly nesting shorebirds, a new place to repopulate, increasing the numbers of wildlife in the area. There are plenty of places dogs and their owners can go, but the wildlife does not have this choice. Dogs are not part of the natural ecosystem, and should be limited in their access to areas in the GGNRA to lessen their impact on wildlife.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1841 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192114 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: First dogs serve as companionship to people, and are not part of the ecosystem. The coast birds are part of the ecosystem and must be protected and maintained. The coast in California is the habitats of birds and must be guarded. The coast birds that live, breed, and nest must be safe-guarded. This dog management plan is to help rescue these coast birds from extinction. The GGNRA has to be dedicated to conservation as a coast guard tradition. Dogs pose a threat to nesting on the Coast. Dogs need to keep distance during nesting seasons and the GGNRA must have a plan + a way to make sure nothing (dogs) do not threaten the birds. the GGNRA plan is good, before a force- a legal force is forced to guard the birds from dogs at gunpoint. the dogs are predators, and serve only as companionship. allowing dogs to continue on bird nurseries is a threat to nature's birds, and coastal bird sanctuaries.

Corr. ID: 3087 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201421 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Pets are important to some families and communities, but dogs are just one animal that is having a significant negative impact on thousands of other animals and plants, and on many other human visitors. Dogs, no matter how loveable, are not a natural part of the GGNRA ecosystem. The parks should be safe and accessible for all users and protect their natural and cultural resources for the future.

Concern ID: 30486

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The invasion of the non-native ravens, crows, raccoons, and feral cats is impacting the native populations in the GGNRA, not dogs. These non-native species are taking over the habitat of native species, and destroying their eggs and nests of birds, leading to less survival.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 312 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181063 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Human beings with their noise and intrusive natures create considerably more havoc on the wild life living in these parks than dogs and some of the wild animals such as coyotes and foxes and badgers and raccoons also cause more havoc on the bird life in our parks than dogs.

Corr. ID: 4614 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210138 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The DEIS fails to address the effect of the large invasion of the non-native crows/ravens at Fort Funston on the native species of birds and animals. There is not a seagull to be found at Fort Funston. The crows/ravens have invaded the cliff areas, have driven off other birds and appear to eat everything and anything. They show no fear of dogs or humans. The DEIS fails to address the destructive effect these birds are having on the native birds and animals of Fort Funston.

The DEIS fails to discuss the clear lack of understandable notice, in both signage and fences, o habitat protection areas at Fort Funston. It just is not present.

Concern ID: 30487

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Many commenters said that they had never, or rarely seen an incident of dogs chasing wildlife, or disrupting wildlife, but did note extensive human-related stress to wildlife, particularly after events and warm days, when a lot of trash was left. Dogs do not scare wildlife, particularly any more so than many of the user groups in the GGNRA, including hang gliders, surfers, bikers, and nature watchers. In fact, dogs may actually benefit some wildlife, like birds, by scaring away feral cats from the GGNRA, a major predator of birds.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 417 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181594 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: As a large proponent of wildlife and habitat preservation, I'm also very unnerved by your claims of "sensitive habitat" as rationale for tighter restrictions. Considering the recent development funded by GGNRA, there seems to be a contradiction. Recent developments at Lands End, Mori Point, and several other parks have ripped up vegetation that has been there for generations (no, not native, but plants that were brought by settlers in the 18th and 19th centuries, which wildlife has adapted to since) in exchange for paved walkways and "quaint" planted areas. From personal experience, I can say that raccoons, foxes, etc... that once were plentiful in the area (never in danger from dogs) have all but disappeared since development commenced

Corr. ID: 2354 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195375 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have never witnessed anyone's dog chasing snowy plovers or harassing wildlife in any of the GGNRA lands that I have visited. The density of people in the surrounding cities have a far larger impact on wildlife in the GGNRA than does the occasional off-leash dog. Please count this letter as a vote against the Preferred Alternative.

Corr. ID: 2586

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195608

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: A small percentage of people may allow their dogs to chase wildlife. These same people allow their children to chase the snowy plovers and other wildlife as well. However, it doesn't make sense to punish the majority of GGNRA users and their dogs with this extreme proposal. A much better solution would be to better educate people about the wildlife at GGNRA and create stiffer penalties for the people who allow their dogs or children to harass the wildlife in any way.

Corr. ID: 4535

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209746

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In over 30 years walking my dogs in the GGNRA, I personally have never seen a dog injure or kill a bird or other mammal. Just the opposite is true--wildlife in an urban environment are used to dogs. We have existed together for years. The Marine Mammal Center has said that they like it when people are walking their dogs on the beach, because we find the injured and stranded marine mammals!

Corr. ID: 4570

Organization: Senior, Half Moon Bay High School

Comment ID: 209843

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: However I believe a better solution is we work hard to educate and encourage responsible dog ownership. Some examples of this would be community's volunteers to stock dog poop bags and regularly host trail clean up days. Also work with the SPCA to provide low cost and free dog training classes. I believe this collaborative approach is best and viable alternative to simply closing areas to dogs or placing new restrictions.

Concern ID:

30488

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Many 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. Wildlife has adjusted over time to dogs so they are no longer viewed as a threat, and dogs are not impacting wildlife. Dog walkers caring about beaches is important.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 519

Organization: Marin Co Veterinary Medical Association

Comment ID: 181933

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The wildlife are among my patients as well and I have a deep concern for them and the environment. I don't believe dogs do a significant degree of damage to wildlife and I do think having this huge group of people (dog owners) caring about the beaches is critical.

Corr. ID: 1767

Organization: Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA

Comment ID: 191519

Organization Type: Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: Our professional wildlife rehabilitation staff completed a review/analysis of the site and the proposal, and we believe that there is no observable reason related to the protection of native wildlife which would justify denying access to off-leash dogs in the area. If there was impact on wildlife, it happened long ago. Wildlife continuing to use this area are most likely well versed in people, bikes, and dogs and probably avoid the area during the day. The overall area is very large and wildlife have adequate space to avoid people and dogs.

Corr. ID: 4657 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209058 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I have been visiting GGNRA lands, including Oakwood Valley and Muir Beach, for decades. 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. Using your weak criteria, one could just as legitimately make the opposite argument that the environment has only improved as the number of dogs has increased.

The document makes wild assumptions that there are negative impacts on the environment due to dogs. There are no studies showing that things are worse today than they were yesterday or even ten years ago. Without a baseline study there is no foundation for these policy changes. I have attached photos of Oakwood Valley to visually demonstrate that flowers and plants are thriving on and near the dog trails. And, more astonishingly, the draft plan assumes all of the alleged negative impacts have been caused by dogs, not humans. Where's the evidence? The document fails to provide long term monitoring data to support its claims that dog activities threaten the parklands. The document's conclusions must be modified based on scientific evidence.

For example, the draft plan says dogs need to be banned to protect stranded marine mammals and shorebirds. There is no documentation or evidence indicating that dogs have ever interfered or caused any harm to those protected species. In fact, I would argue that humans without dogs have caused much more harm to the environment and wildlife, from trampling plants and grass by holding huge festivals to the subsequent littering. Where is there a comparison of exclusively human impacts and exclusively dog impacts? Perhaps, humans should be banned.

Concern ID: 30489
CONCERN STATEMENT: [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. There are few areas for off-leash dog walking, and wildlife in the GGNRA should not be held above the need for recreational space in the GGNRA.](#)

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1594 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 190824 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: There are 1000 miles of coast in California where native plants and wildlife can thrive. San Francisco is a densely populated area where people need places to exercise their dogs. Compressing the growing dog population into less and less space will only lead to more management issues with this population.

Concern ID: 30490
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Dog use of trails and beaches has had documented negative impacts on bird populations.](#)
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2144 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 193439 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Measures of impact of these alternatives on specise abundance + diversity should be made on test sites. Published data (ie biology letters - 1977) document 47% reduction in bird diversity along trails used by dogs.

Concern ID: 30492
CONCERN STATEMENT: [Dog waste can negatively alter soil chemistry and native ecosystems, which can impact species in the GGNRA that use olfactory cues, like butterflies.](#)

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29620 (VR2010), Comment 206064 and Concern 30421 (VU2010), Comment 202973.

WH4000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Concern ID: 30493

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Restrictions on beaches should be tight to protect wildlife, and surveys should be undertaken to make sure that beaches with seasonal wildlife have adequate protection. Allowing dogs off-leash on the beach in beach ROLAs would negatively impact wildlife, such as birds and marine mammals, which are sometimes harassed or chased by dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4683

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 210181

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Beaches: Beaches are a particular problem since the resource itself is washed clean with tides and storms and impacts are not to be seen. However there are significant impacts to wildlife that use our beaches. The simplest example is illustrated in the attached photo of the dog chasing Willets on Ocean Beach. From birds as common as Willets and Western Gulls, to the Federally listed Western Snowy Plover, dogs have an incredible impact on birds. For that reason dog use of beaches should be highly restricted. Beach areas known for bird roosting should be off limits to dogs. A practice that would be consistent with NPS regulations would be to ban dogs from all beaches in GGNRA. Since that seems unlikely dogs should be limited to a bare minimum of beach areas. No beach should be entirely open to dogs. A compromise might be to limit dogs to no more than some percentage of any given beach. Given the habitat value of beaches, we would think that limitation should be areas adjacent to parking lots with an outside limit of 30% of the entire beach. That at least would allow space for wildlife. It is important to note that many beaches will have little or no wildlife presence during parts of the year. A survey might be appropriate to determine if a given beach is in fact devoid of wildlife. In that case other criteria might be used to determine what if any dog use might be appropriate.

Concern ID:

30495

CONCERN STATEMENT:

It has not been shown that removing dogs from the GGNRA will have a beneficial impact on wildlife in the park, which is already flourishing in the parks, despite the current presence of dogs. The current protections under alternative A are already protecting wildlife. One measure that would improve this would be to fix up signs and fencing in the park.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 409

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181575

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please strongly consider Alternative A (No Change). I find all other Alternatives to be extremely restrictive with not enough benefit to the surrounding wildlife and other benefits cited in the documents.

Corr. ID: 1626

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 190933

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There is no shown benefit to complete exclusion of dogs for shorebird wildlife encouragement, these leashed walking areas should continue even where off leash is precluded.

In all the literatures and preferred analysis I have seen no sufficient basis for thinking dog walking is at all related to the problems with bank swallows.

Corr. ID: 3761

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204651 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I have yet to hear anything that even begins to convince me that their plan will benefit the bay area urban wildlife enough to warrant the drastic changes they propose for dog access to the parklands. Any tour of most of the land in question will reveal wildlife flourishing in proximity to people and their dogs. It is only because wild species are doing well under the present setup that there is any wildlife to protect and manage.

Corr. ID: 3883 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 205892 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are adequate protections for sensitive land and wildlife. The GGNRA should better maintain these protections-specifically the fencing on the beach at Crissy field where sand has covered it. This is a simple fix rather than restricting use.

It is not appropriate to restrict all dog owners for the few issues with a small percentage of dogs. The reasonable response to this problem is to educate visitors, improve signage and help park visitors follow the rules and learn how to respect the environment, not to ban the rest of us with dogs from the GGNRA.

I do not agree with the GGNRA's 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) are not based upon sound science or long-term monitoring of site specific conditions. I am concerned about the long-term preservation of the GGNRA's natural resources and want to protect these important natural areas, but other options besides restricting dog-walking access should be considered first.

Concern ID: 30496

CONCERN STATEMENT: *If impacts to wildlife from dogs are found to be present, they should be mitigated by having dogs on-leash or banning them in the areas where the wildlife is, not every area. Dogs need to be under control either on-leash, or under true voice control.*

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1899 **Organization:** Bay Nature Institute

Comment ID: 200437 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And given the difficulty of educating and training all dog owners to keep their dogs under voice command and to recognize rare and endangered wildlife, it seems to me that there is a reasonable basis for banning off-leash access in areas that are determined -- by scientific study -- to serve as habitat for wildlife that would be adversely affected by the presence of such domesticated predators... i.e. off-leash dogs. In other areas, where human presence has so degraded habitat that coexistence with sensitive wildlife species is no longer likely or possible, then it seems to me that off-leash dog recreation should be considered, as long as it does not conflict with more passive recreation by other humans.

Corr. ID: 4708 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209753 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If you're worried that off leash dogs will molest wildlife - have a leash requirement JUST IN THOSE AREAS.

Concern ID: 30497

CONCERN STATEMENT: *Having a fence on the Oakwood Valley trail would negatively impact wildlife by creating a barrier to movement, especially of smaller species.*

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4312 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209376 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Another consideration I would like to point out is the fact that the proposed fence that the Plan currently shows being built along the Oakwood Valley Fire Road will in all likelihood have a greater negative impact on the local wildlife than the off-leash dog walking that will be allowed there. Having a Fence there will not allow wildlife to cross from one side of the road to the other, which I am sure it currently does all the time when dogs are not present. In recent years we have become more and more aware of the severe impact that fenced roads have on wildlife and the environment.

Concern ID: 30498

CONCERN STATEMENT: Park rangers patrolling sites by car for non-compliance would have a much greater negative impact on wildlife than dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4312 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209377 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While it is true that the length of the Oakwood Valley Fire Road being fenced is much shorter than those examples, it will be a significant barrier for any animal smaller than a deer or coyote. Another adverse environmental impact of the plan as currently formulated will be the additional vehicular traffic by park police performing the surveillance needed to enforce the new restrictions. This added vehicular traffic will have a greater impact than the dogs being walked that they are trying to control.

Concern ID: 30499

CONCERN STATEMENT: The proposed plan is a fair and balanced plan, which will protect wildlife from unregulated dog-walking recreation. Even if only a few dogs harass wildlife, these few dogs can have a significant impact. It is reasonable to have off-leash areas limited to protect wildlife.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 352 **Organization:** Marin Audubon Society, MCL, Sierra Club, North Bay Hikers

Comment ID: 181127 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I fully support and encourage the directors to accept the dog management plan. I support this plan for two reasons:

1. Protection of birdlife and habitat
2. Protection of recreational beaches for enjoyment by children and adults.

Corr. ID: 2311 **Organization:** Calif Academy of Sciences

Comment ID: 195291 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I support the leash plan for Dog Management in GGNRA. Shoreline wildlife needs to be protected from offleash dogs.

Corr. ID: 2610 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195534 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: We have visited this are with our dogs. It is nice to have some areas that are dog friendly, off-leash, but we have no problem with these areas being restricted to certain parts of the coast in order to protect the wild-life.

Corr. ID: 2672 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195519 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I wholeheartedly support the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan. All dogs should be on-leash or in enclosed areas for their own safety and that of wildlife. Wildlife and their habitats, especially threatened and endangered species, in the GGNRA and greater area is under constant threat and protecting that wildlife must be a high Park Service priority and given sufficient funding.

Corr. ID: 2769 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201086 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I'm writing to support the preferred alternative or stronger. There are so many dogs at the beach that a minority of those dogs are still enough to unnecessarily impact the birds. Even if they're not immediately dropping dead. As you know. Meanwhile the dogs go home and eat undisturbed.

Corr. ID: 2772 **Organization:** Mt. Tamalpais Interpretive Association

Comment ID: 201090 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Very good proposal fair and balanced. The national parks cannot be considered as private dog runs. Very damaging to wildlife, the environment, and other users.

Concern ID: 30500

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Removing dogs from areas where they previously have disturbed wildlife habitat, particularly nesting birds, may allow for a return of nesting and activity to these sites. Having restrictions on dogs may allow wildlife to return, and park visitors could then observe wildlife in these areas.

For additional representative quotes, please see Concern 29245 (MB1100), Comment 209140.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4132 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208564 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While walking on Ocean Beach I noticed a woman whose dog was running loose. When I informed her that this was a protected area for birds she replied "It's ok. There aren't any cops around."

A man who I informed about the protected area at Ocean Beach said "My dogs never catch the birds so it's ok." He went on to say that he would let his dogs run loose wherever he wants.

Dogs seem to run wild everywhere. Why can't people have some space where we do not have to put up with dogs running wild? On Ocean Beach this would also greatly benefit the birds in the area and we would see more birds when they are not constantly frightened by dogs running after them.

Concern ID: 30501

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Wildlife will never be safely protected from dogs off-leash. By having areas where dogs are allowed off-leash, NPS is creating areas of potential habitat that wildlife will never inhabit due to the dogs.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4470 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208701 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The National Parks are one of the last refuges of wildlife. Any area with dogs running without a leash is not safe for wildlife and never will be. This plan will create zones that will never be useable habitat for the wildlife that National Parks are supposed to protect. They will be zones barren of any life except dogs

Concern ID: 30502

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Some areas of the park should be entirely off-limits to dogs, for the protection of wildlife. Areas where dogs are allowed, particularly off-leash, should not be placed in areas with wildlife or wildlife habitat, particularly sensitive wildlife. Some commenters suggested that off-leash areas be fenced to provide better protection of wildlife.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2385 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202179 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I believe that all off-leash areas should be enclosed to protect park users, wildlife, and other dogs and that off-leash recreation should be limited to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats.

Corr. ID: 2652

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195454

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regulations must require all off-leash areas to be enclosed to protect park users, wildlife, and other dogs.

Regulations must limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats.

Protection of wildlife and habitats must have priority over dogs.

Corr. ID: 2655

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195445

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am a dog owner and I do like to go to off-leash places where my small dogs can run free. BUT, just as I believe it is my responsibility to clean up after them, I also believe that there should be serious and effective protection of wildlife. So I think that Golden Gate Park should have off-leash areas, but fenced in such a way that the dogs, wildlife, and everyone else is protected.

The off-leash area should be in one that is not environmentally sensitive. And it should be large enough that it will accommodate the needs of pet owners. The rest of the park should be protected from off-leash dogs.

Corr. ID: 2819

Organization: Sierra Club

Comment ID: 201127

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Thank you to the National Park Service for working to implement a Dog Management Plan. Please go further with this plan by ensuring the protection of wildlife in the area. This can be done by ensuring that all off-leash areas are enclosed. Such areas should also be limited to areas without sensitive wildlife. The Park Service should also ensure that rules of the park, particularly those that protect wildlife and people are enforced. Alternative D is the best one, and should be adopted.

Corr. ID: 3623

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204123

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I strongly support restricting dogs, especially off-leash dogs, in sensitive habitat areas. Too many times I have witnessed wildlife being harassed and chased. Habitat and wildlife are precious resources that deserve respect and protection.

Corr. ID: 3734

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 204230

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please protect the wildlife by not allowing unleashed dogs to have full access to GGNRA. It would be my hope that designated areas for dogs can be established in areas that will not adversely impact the wildlife, nor the habitat.

Concern ID:

30503

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

If signs indicating areas of wildlife habitat were put up, dog owners would obey these rules. At present, it is hard to know what areas are protected.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 4430

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 208565

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Where there are very sensitive wildlife areas, they should be WELL marked.

We responsible dog owners are concerned with preserving our natural resources and need a little direction as to where these areas are.

Concern ID: 30504

CONCERN STATEMENT: Restraining dogs on-leash in the GGNRA will assure the safety of both wildlife and dogs. While dogs disturb wildlife, wildlife also poses a threat to dogs from conflicts during interaction, parasites, and disease.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2190 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200585 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please do not allow any dogs off leash anywhere in the park. Please impose severe fines and punishments for those who allow there dogs to be off leash. I would very much like going to this space but feel threatened by dogs and aggressive dog owners. I enjoy the wildlife and have witnessed on more than one occasion dogs chasing and killing birds

Corr. ID: 2233 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200859 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The wildlife MUST be given top priority, because they can't protect themselves from us (or from our pets). Dogs and other exotic species do not belong in our parks and other wildlife habitat. At a minimum, they should always be on a short 6 foot leash. But it is preferable to ban them from our national parks.

Concern ID: 30505

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dogs should not be banned at Muir Beach to protect wildlife. Rather, Redwood Creek should be closed, even fenced, and areas where migrating birds nest should be closed on a seasonal basis.

For representative quotes, please see Concern (29248 (MB1200), Comment 203793.

Concern ID: 30506

CONCERN STATEMENT: The eastern portion of Crissy Airfield should be off-limits to dogs, in order to protect grassland bird species.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2965 **Organization:** Urban Estuary Network

Comment ID: 203625 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And in hot weather the tidal channel is always full of mothers with toddlers splashing in the water - probably the only place in S.F. where they can. Those users need shielded from off-leash dogs.

Now that a ROLA is designated for the central part of the Airfield can the eastern portion now be turned over to the marsh? I've never been able to see an outline of the old runways in the grasses there - does anyone? The ROLA would seem to make the pattern even less obvious.

Originally there were plans to have an aeronautical museum with old planes parked around to evoke Crissy's original purpose; those plans never came to fruition and the whole thrust of the Crissy experience now is nature. Time to jettison the Airfield and enlarge the tidal marsh westward.

Certainly the eastern portion of the Airfield should be a no-dog area to protect the grassland birds that are frequently found there in migration.

And of course, enforcement of the leash laws on the Promenade should be 100%,

with one dog per person and no commercial dog walking.

Concern ID: 30507

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The preferred alternative does not go far enough to protect wildlife. Alternative D is necessary to provide the best protection of wildlife from off-leash dogs and non-compliant owners. Compliance with the rules needs to be higher than 75%.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2918 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 203314 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I am writing in regards to the Draft Dog Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. I have lived in the San Francisco Bay area for nearly 30 years. During that time, the population of both humans and their pets have greatly increased. I visit Golden Gate National Recreation Area for hiking and birdwatching. I have frequently witnessed dogs chasing shorebirds; gulls, and other species. This disturbance is harmful to the birds, and very disruptive to my recreation.

I write in support of Alternative D: Most Protective Based on Resource Protection and Visitor Safety the least environmentally damaging alternative. Frankly, I think that dogs should be eliminated from all of our federal lands. The problem, of course, is not so much the dogs but their owners. I frequently make polite comments that there is a leash law, that I would prefer that a dog, not jump on my clean pants with its muddy paws, or that having their dog lick my binoculars (yes, this has happened) is not conducive with nature observation and birding. I get a polite response only about 25% of the time, and of these responses often there is absolutely no attempt by the dog owner to regulate their dog's behavior. About 25% of the people do not respond at all, and I often get a rude to extremely rude response such as "shut up -- this is none of your business" (Bolin Ridge, GGNRA, March 2010). My response was that it was indeed my business as I was also there to enjoy OUR public lands and that one of the mandates of the National Park Service was to protect wildlife, which the dog in question was most definitely disturbing by running several hundred yards off leash at great speed.

Needless to say, considering allowing voice-control, as proposed under Alternative A. at Ocean Beach in the sensitive Snowy Plover area would be completely irresponsible and provision of habitat for this endangered species.

Allowing up to three dogs per commercial dog walker -- or private dog walker -- is absurd. Again, many impacts to the passive (non-dog) user as well as wildlife.

Not only do I endorse Alternative D, but I urge the Park Service to strictly and consistently enforce dog regulations.

Corr. ID: 3269 **Organization:** Clean Air Now

Comment ID: 202799 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Clean Air Now's Board of Directors is concerned with the protection of wildlife and habitat in our national parks. Safe and secure recreation is important for the public's exposure to healthful air, relaxation, and the natural environment. It is the National Parks Service's job to ensure that human activity does not infringe on that critical need in society. All creatures must coexist in balance, and because of this we ask that you implement the EIS's "Alternative D". The park's mission is to protect the natural and cultural resources, not allow recreation to undermine it. Alternative D best reflects the national park values. We are all dog lovers, but we also see the need to properly exercise our dogs without harm to others.

Corr. ID: 3313 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202918 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: While recreation is important, the park's primary mission should be to protect natural and cultural resources. I support Alternative D.

Habitat for endangered species should be given a higher level of protection from human disturbance; the compliance rate should be 95%, not 75% as outlined.

Also, while I support dog owners having a place for off-leash time with their pets, this must be done in a way that protects the local wildlife (especially during nesting seasons).

Corr. ID: 3701 **Organization:** Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter

Comment ID: 202225 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter urges the GGNRA to reject the Preferred Alternative identified in the above referenced DEIS due to that Alternative's inadequacy in protecting native plant and wildlife species, including listed species, as well as its failure to provide undisturbed national park experiences (nature recreation, education and science) to its visitors due to the impacts of off-leash and leashed dogs.

Instead, we urge you to adopt Alternative D, "Most Protective of Resource" as the alternative most appropriate for implementing a GGNRA Dog Management Plan that protects the parks natural resources and provides appropriate visitor experiences. We also urge you to add a further component to Alternative D. We believe it is essential that ROLAs be delineated by physical boundaries in order for dog walkers to more easily determine the location of these ROLAs and to facilitate enforcement of ROLAs by providing clearly discernible borders.

Concern ID: 30508

CONCERN STATEMENT: Heavy fines should be enforced for visitors who let their dogs harass wildlife or run off-leash, in order to protect wildlife.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2829 **Organization:** NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION

Comment ID: 201146 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: DOGS ARE PETS AND DESERVE LOVE AND CARE BUT ALSO DISCIPLINE HARASSING WILDLIFE IS WRONG AND THE OWNERS SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE WITH FINES OR BANISHMENT.

Corr. ID: 3411 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 201398 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Wildlife's right to survival must trump human's right to witness it!!!

\$5,000 dollar fine and 6 months jail mandatory minimum sentence for any unleashed animal. No plea bargain or suspended sentences.

Algerian Ivy eradication needed. Non-native ice-plant removed and replaced with native species.

Concern ID: 30509

CONCERN STATEMENT: Other threats to wildlife, such as feral cats, development, hang gliders and recreational vehicles, should be removed from the park to protect bird species and other wildlife. Dogs do impact birds and other wildlife, but these threats are also significant.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2406 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200643 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The Golden Gate Recreation area must be kept sacred as wildlife habitat. Your job is to protect wildlife, not open up critical habitat to human destruction. Please immediately keep this area off-limits to any development, and pristine as a habitat.

Corr. ID: 2417 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200660 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The main issue I believe that needs to be addressed when working to protect wildlife is recreational vehicles. In my opinion people who love to use off road motorized vehicles with huge tires and loud engines are the ones who pose the biggest threat to the lives of animals. There are also issues with dogs harassing birds, but I believe that people are the ones who do the most damage. there should be designated areas that are for leashed dogs and some so dogs can run off leash like there are at Fort Funston. Trails should be well marked and there needs to be places where birds and other wildlife are protected so no humans, dogs or off road vehicles are allowed.

Corr. ID: 2484 **Organization:** American Bird Conservancy

Comment ID: 200813 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Feral cats must also be removed from the Golden Gate Recreation Area. It must be illegal to establish and feed free roaming cat colonies in parks. Feral cat colonies are fed by caretakers and the feral cats stay in one area because of the food supply. They have decimated quails in the area and are the threat to future generations of birds since they kill fledglings that are still unable to fly.

Wildlife in parks must be protected from *domestic animals* such as cats and dogs.

Corr. ID: 4705 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209745 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: If the GGNRA's preferred alternative goes through, the only users of Fort Funston will be the hang gliders. (Maybe they are impacting the habitats of the birds in the area by flying around.)

Concern ID:

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

30510

There should be areas in the GGNRA that are fenced for off-leash dog walking, and some areas for on-leash dog walking, but the majority of the park should be dog-free to protect wildlife, so that they can feed, rest, and breed unmolested. There are many places where dog owners can recreate, but the wildlife does not have more habitat, and these areas need to be protected.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1653 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191048 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I go to Ocean Beach 1-3/4 times a week at various times a day. I've NEVER been there to my recollection with out seeing at least one dog chasing shorebirds, often with the owners watching and doing nothing. Yes, I know this is a minority, but to the migrating birds who need to use their energy to feed, this means that large potential (non-native) predators can interrupt them at any time. The birds are declining as a result. Dogs have other places to go to build community. Frankly, it's not just the beach. I've heard from parents who don't want dogs in the playgrounds where dogs aren't supposed to be, etc.

The National Parks, wherever they are, are supposed to be protecting special status specie. Threatened species, wherever they area. Birds only have so much habitat. Dogs do have more choices. Let the birds have the little habitat we've left them. Let the dogs play elsewhere.

Corr. ID: 1791

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200282

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: However my interest of concern is maintaining as much as possible if not entirely dog free Golden Gate National Parks. A exception being Fort Funston due to it's past practice designation.

My familiarity as a volunteer and visitor of Mori Point, Milagra Ridge and Sweeney Ridge of the San Mateo County Parklands, prompts me to discourage any dog activity that would ultimately threaten these sensitive wildlife sanctuaries.

Dog walking should not be allowed on the Mori Point Timigtac Trail.

Corr. ID: 2091

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200563

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: However, I am also a bird spotter and enjoy seeing the many beautiful and unfortunately sometimes threatened species. These wild animals need secure places where they can feed and breed unmolested or they may not survive. Dogs are not threatened and live in comfort and security with humans. We need to keep wild areas that are free from domestic animals so that the birds may thrive and not be harassed.

Most of the GGNRA should be off limits to dogs, even supposedly leashed ones. I often visit Heron's Head Park where there are many very visible signs requesting that dogs be kept on leashes, yet every time I go there I see dogs running free, sometimes in the direction of nesting birds. Many dog owners are respectful of the ordinances about leash requirements, but many are not. Let there be areas in the GGNRA where leashed dogs are allowed, fenced areas where they may run free, but please keep most of the GGNRA free of pets.

Corr. ID: 2603

Organization: arbor day foundation

Comment ID: 195542

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: There are more than enough places for people to go to enjoy the outdoors. There are also plenty of places for people to allow their dogs to run around. Let's face it, dogs aren't endangered and probably never will be, do they really NEED to be able to run around in a protected wildlife area? NO. This is ridiculous. This place has been set aside for wildlife, ONLY wildlife. We have taken over 95% of what used to be "wild", can't we let the animals have their small chunk of space and leave it at that?

Corr. ID: 2636

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 195465

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I love dogs and and I love wildlife but, in the end, dogs have many more options for recreation than do wild species for survival. Please preserve this bit of land for the plovers and their wild friends to do what they've been doing since the beginning of time, living.

Concern ID:

30511

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

If dogs are removed from some areas of the GGNRA where wildlife was previously kept at bay by their presence, it could result in greater use of areas by wildlife. As a result, more conflicts between users of the GGNRA and wildlife may occur, including more incidents between wildlife and human ecosystems. Removing dogs may also increase the feral cat population, which is detrimental to birds.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 753

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 185429

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: wildlife adjustment. deer, skunk, raccoons, rats, other

rodents, feral cats, cougars, bobcats, coyotes, and even snakes may re-enter current "dog zones" due to less fear of encountering both dogs and humans. these can be represented as signs of a healthier eco-system. however, the reintroduction of wildlife can become an endangerment to park visitors and eventually become a great tragedy and loss for not only park visitors, but also for wildlife. dogs have managed to keep wildlife at "bay" in most areas of highly traffic off leash dog use areas. if the park system elects to close off specific areas to re-habilitate the ecology, wildlife will eventually re-enter these areas and may cause more problems. deer may become a hazard in areas where once there were no signs. deer may cross roads, injure motorists; resulting in fatalities, both in humans and the deer population.

cougars may encroach these new deer populated areas, resulting in more cougar sightings, accidental attacks on humans or pets (primarily small pets and small children), eventually contributing to fish and game obligated to destroy our precious california mountain lion population.

coyotes and bobcats may follow suit and become entangled in an urban wildlife management crisis that is denied in the documentation provided in the nps proposal for eco restoration and management, resulting in even more damage to our current wildlife endangered already from urban sprawl.

Concern ID:

30512

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Overall, alternative C provides the best protection of natural areas and wildlife.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29646 (GC9020), Comment 181170.

Concern ID:

30513

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Commenters voiced concerns that if dogs continue to be off-leash, they could be attacked by natural predators, with the result being removal or killing of the wildlife, such as coyotes, or mountain lions. Signs about these wild animals may help prevent this.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 219

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 180685

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Regardless of decisions made, people will continue to allow their dogs to run off-leash in the less populated areas of the GGNRA. My concern is that when a mountain lion or coyote attacks somebody's dog that the wild animal will be seen as a nuisance and killed. (I've already watched coyotes stalk leashed dogs, so this is just a matter of time.) I'd like to see some sort of safeguard in place for the animals that belong in the parks rather than for those that only visit. Maybe posting warning signs. I don't want to see more signs, but some people don't believe that their dogs are seen as trespassers or moving snacks to local fauna.

WH5000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts

There were no comments for WH5000

WH6000 - Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impairment Analyses

There were no comments for WH6000

WQ4000 - Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Concern ID: 29543

CONCERN

STATEMENT:

Commenters believe that dog feces on the beaches would be eliminated by wave action and strong currents and that any fecal water contamination would be due to sewage overflow. Commenters do not believe that beaches with dogs have higher bacteria counts than beaches without dogs based on the SFPUC monitoring reports and Heal the Bay reports.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 23 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 181456 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Please allow responsible pet owners to continue to enjoy the area in line with the 1979 Pet Policy. I would take issue with the rationale that is being presented to change the rules from the 1979 Pet Policy:

-Data presented for problems within the existing rules seem extremely low, and do not support any change

-The main problem presented within the data seems to be for off-leash violations, however the problem with dogs present within restricted area are quite low.

-Fecal contamination by dogs at Ocean beach is cited as a rationale for restricting dogs, however due to strong currents and wave action, the only time I can remember any problem with water quality at Ocean Beach is due to sewage overflow.

Corr. ID: 3725 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 202341 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In the DEIS, "A substudy of the San Francisco Sewage Master Plan determined that bacterial contamination of the water off Ocean Beach was significant due to dog fecal matter deposited along the shoreline. (NPs, 1999)" (DEIS, p 228, para.5)

See, this is just one example of why we don't trust you, GGNRA. Why would you include this statement in your DEIS when you know this "substudy" was impossible to track down? During Negotiate Rulemaking in 2007, NPS admitted neither they nor the SF PUC Water Quality Bureau could find it, yet here in 2011 you made this claim sound like it came from a real document. And this is your basis for the accusation that dogs contaminate the water starting with the Executive Summary.

You actually had real data to draw from regarding water quality at Ocean Beach and elsewhere. The SFPUC website has information available to the public. The reason you didn't is THERE IS NO PROOF DOGS ARE CONTAMINATING THE WATER. To the contrary, there is evidence fecal contamination doesn't exist there at all. The SFPUC monitoring San Francisco beaches showed off-leash beaches do not have higher bacterial contamination than beaches where dogs are prohibited.

On May 26, 2011, a front-page story in the San Francisco Chronicle was entitled, "Where Not to Go in the Water at Bay Beaches." The environmental group Heal the Bay annually rates the Bay Area Beaches, among others, and concluded, "Ten Bay Area beach locations received perfect scores and were named to the groups' honor roll, including Ocean Beach at both Balboa Ave. and Sloat Blvd., Crown Memorial St. Beach in Alameda, Montara State Beach, Surfers Beach, and six others in San Mateo County." (p.1,12)

Concern ID: 29544

CONCERN STATEMENT: To keep dog feces out of the oceans there needs to be strict enforcement of dog waste pickup laws.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 3713 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 202254 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Dogs/domestic animals on leash in all parks.. along with feces-pickup enforcement

No dogs/domestic animals in critical habitat!

Specified leash-free areas especially with strict feces-pickup enforcement

Dogs need outdoor space to run of course..
meanwhile we Need to keep feces out of ocean!

Concern ID: 29545
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters have reported seeing dogs in the marsh at Crissy Field which has inadequate flushing; therefore, requiring dogs to be on-leash at Central Beach and the promenade area will help keep dogs from running into the marsh thus preventing water quality issues.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29475 (CF1400), Comment 203616

Concern ID: 29546
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters have stated that removing dogs from a site will not reduce the risk from rabies and the parvovirus because rabies is also common in mammalian wildlife and the parvovirus is endemic and can be transported on shoes, bicycles. Giardia is also endemic in GGNRA waters.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4601 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 209936 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: "Water Quality" (pg. 64 of the DMP/EIS) state that dogs may bring rabies and parvovirus into the area. This is clearly true. However - removing the dogs does not reduce the risk! Rabies is more common in mammalian wildlife - including bats, coyotes, foxes, and raccoons than in domestic dogs, who are generally vaccinated. Parvovirus is endemic. It can be transported into an area on the soles of shoes or on bicycle tires. (Consider the experience of the original wolf pack on Ile Royale.) Thus, the statement is misleading with respect to the impact of dogs on wildlife disease and water quality. Similarly, giardia is already endemic in GGNRA waters.

Concern ID: 29547
CONCERN STATEMENT: The negative impacts in the plan from off-leash dogs should be peer reviewed and should be based on specific studies conducted at the park. The plan has failed to prove with facts that dogs are contaminating the water at GGNRA.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 1835 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 191984 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Although this time the GGNRA is supporting the agenda with environmental rationalization, the allegations in the report have not been proven and are not peer reviewed. In summary they are as follows:

1) The negative impact of off-leash dogs on the environment of these Bay Area parks due to accelerating erosion, and being destructive to the plants, animals, diversity, and ground water.

2) Off-leash dogs represent a safety hazard to people using these parks.

After attending the Fort Mason Open House I'm convinced that nowhere in the GGNRA proposal are there substantive studies or proof for these allegations against off-leash dogs. In contrast, these allegations are refuted in studies such as those listed at the end of this letter: Reference 2 (Scientific Assessment of Impact of Dogs on Birds, Snowy Plovers, Small Mammals, Wildlife Diversity, Vegetation and Bodies of Water In Urban Recreational Parks of the Bay Area) and Reference 3 (Statistics and Analysis of Safety Issues Associated with Dogs in Bay Area Parks, and Comparison to Reported Incidents Not Involving Dogs).

Concern ID:

29548

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The plan has failed to provide evidence for the attribution of poor water quality from dog waste in the tidal marsh at Crissy Field. The commenter feels that the poor water quality in the marsh is more reflective of its shallowness and stagnation. Also, runoff from the drains along the promenade, bird waste, and decaying vegetation in the marsh contribute to poor water quality conditions. In addition, hikers, bikers, and horses cause erosion on the sand dunes, and golf courses near the headlands over use the water table and contribute pesticides to nearby water systems.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 1850

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 192073

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Currently, the eastern third of Crissy Airfield., which drains into the Crissy Marsh, receives a moderate to high level of use by off-leash dogs and a substantial amount of pet waste."

Comment: The DEIS fails to provide evidence for the attribution of poor water quality in the tidal marsh to pet waste in the eastern portion of the Airfield. The DEIS should remove the sentence regarding pet waste from this section and should address the following factors as more likely sources of poor water quality and low oxygen levels in the tidal marsh:

- Tidal marshes depend on daily tidal surges to reinvigorate the marsh (as explained in graphics near the tidal marsh). The Crissy Field "tidal marsh" does not benefit from the tidal effects because the inlet to the Bay is often closed for long periods of time, due to local conditions and, apparently, to failure by the Park Service to follow recommendations from designers on appropriate size for the marsh (minimum 30 acres versus actual 18 acres built). As a result, the shallow marsh tends to be stagnant and water quality becomes poor.

- The grassy Airfield is flat, covered with a thick coating of grass. After heavy rain the Airfield is characterized by significant amounts of boggy ground and standing water, suggesting it is not draining anywhere. In any case, the Park Service oversaw design and construction of the Airfield in 1997, so why did they have it drain into the marsh?

- The grassy Airfield abuts the marsh on one end, representing less than 20% of the shoreline of the marsh. Along the long edges of the marsh accounting for at least 60% of the shoreline are Mason street on one side and the Golden Gate Promenade on the other side. There are drains (8-10) along the promenade that take runoff into the marsh from the promenade during rain. (I have seen them with water flowing through during a rainstorm.) There are also two culverts on the Mason Street side of the marsh that appear to allow run-off from somewhere up in the Presidio. Contaminants are likely coming from these other sources rather than the Airfield.

- There is vegetation around the marsh and there are significant numbers of birds in

the marsh'all of these create material (decaying vegetation and bird "poop") that can directly affect water quality, leading to low oxygen levels if water is stagnant.

Corr. ID: 4396

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 209570

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: And it is the hikers, bikers, and horses that cause erosion of the sand dunes far more effectively than the the canines due to the sheer size and continuity of their footprints. And it is the lawns and golf courses near the headlands that over-use the water table and pollute it with pesticides. The dog waste which we try to pick up is at least biodegradable.

WQ5000 - Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts

There were no comments for WQ5000

WR6000 - Water Resources: Impairment Analyses

There were no comments for WQ6000

WR2010 - Water Resources: Affected Environment

Concern ID:

29540

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

The DEIS fails to address the pre-existing sewer lines of San Francisco that discharge into the ocean, the excavation to update these lines and the stabilization of the cliffs at Fort Funston.

For representative quotes, please see Concern 29506 (GR2010), Comment 207082

Concern ID:

29541

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:**

Commenters have reported that they frequently encounter dog waste, dog waste in bags, and dog urine on Ocean Beach, Crissy Field/Beach, and Fort Funston which they believe contributes to water quality issues at the beaches and lagoon at Crissy Field. Other commenters feel that creeks along trails are also susceptible to impacts from dogs.

Representative Quote(s):

Corr. ID: 959

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191592

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: One final note: I hear the the water quality on at least one trail/fire road are in Novato has been seriously degraded due to dogs, off leash, running free and defecating in the creeks.

Corr. ID: 1648

Organization: *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 191034

Organization Type: Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Every time I walk on Ocean Beach, Crissy Field/Beach or the Presidio I encounter piles of dog-doo and plastic bags containing (presumably) dog doo. I also see dog guardians allowing their charges to chase shorebirds, which I find cruel.

On the beach at Crissy there must be a great deal of dog pee. That is utterly unappealing for a beach visit. (an pollutes the BAY + LAGOON). I went to Ft. Funston once but will not go back. The place is absolutely gorgeous but it is a reeking dog toilet.

I don't know of any GGNRA place I can visit without encountering dog feces or urine. (The same can be said of the City in general, but this is about the GGNRA)

Concern ID: 29542

CONCERN STATEMENT: Dogs are not part of a natural ecosystem. Their presence can be disruptive and destructive to areas such as fish bearing creeks.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 2202 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 200711 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Unfortunately dogs aren't really part of the natural ecosystem, and their presence is generally disruptive at best and quite destructive at worst when, for example, dogs go into fish bearing creeks with spawning redds, etc. As a hiker and park user, I would prefer to enjoy nature without dogs on the trails, but do not object to on-leash dogs in appropriate areas i.e., those without sensitive species and habitats

Concern ID: 31877

CONCERN STATEMENT: There is no evidence indicating that diseases transmitted by dogs are present in water, or that dog waste changes water nutrient levels. More data is needed to show such impacts.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 4686 **Organization:** The Marin Humane Society

Comment ID: 227781 **Organization Type:** Non-Governmental

Representative Quote: "Water Quality"- The draft plan is extraordinarily insufficient in fact on this topic. More importantly, we believe it is dramatically inaccurate and misleading. Our organization is highly knowledgeable about disease transmission of dogs, especially rabies, parvo and distemper. There are no known studies to our knowledge that claim that these three diseases survive in water and we strongly believe that this statement is incorrect and should be removed. Additionally, we question the accuracy of changing water nutrient levels from dogs. We would recommend that the scientific data and reports used to make this statement be supported in the document. The plan refers to turbidity issues from dogs and this statement does raise concerns on potentially negative issues to certain waterways, but again we urge that these assumptions be substantiated by factual documentation and they should be site specific to each location. Many of the water and wetland areas of the Marin sites can dramatically change through the natural seasonal rainfall process which may also be a factor.